NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

NOTES ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY
FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

by

Gregg H. S. Golden

December 2011

Thesis Co-Advisors: N. T. Anders Strindberg
                                         Stanley B. Supinski

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		*Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188*
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.		
1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	**2. REPORT DATE** December 2011	**3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED** Master's Thesis
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Notes on a National Strategy for Global Education		**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**
6. AUTHOR(S) Gregg H. S. Golden		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. IRB Protocol Number _____N/A_____ .		
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE** A
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) Scholarly literature and anecdotal reports have long suggested that the Americans lack the language skills and cultural competence to carry out the Nation's business effectively, in both the public and the private sectors, despite almost 75 years of federal support for cross-cultural and language education. This study sought to answer the questions whether there is in fact a problem; if so, why; and whether a national strategy for global education could contribute to the solution of the problem. Semi-structured interviews were held with a convenience sample of respondents connected with the intelligence, defense, diplomatic, and academic communities, and the private sector, and the results transcribed and coded thematically. Results were supplemented by relevant literature. Although the results were not unanimous, the respondents generally agreed that improvements in global education were critical to national and homeland security, including the Nation's ability to remain competitive in an increasingly global economy, and that a national strategy would be a useful tool for providing the necessary political leadership and public education. The respondents also offered preliminary thoughts on how a national strategy might be developed, what goals it might seek to achieve, and issues to be considered in planning.		
14. SUBJECT TERMS Intercultural education; multicultural education; global education; language education; language skills; cultural competence; homeland security; national strategy		**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 168
		16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified · **20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UU

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18

i

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

NOTES ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

Gregg H. S. Golden
Senior Counsel, Transportation Security Administration
A.B., Grinnell College, 1975
J.D., Georgetown University, 1980

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(HOMELAND DEFENSE AND SECURITY)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2011**

Author: Gregg H. S. Golden

Approved by: N. T. Anders Strindberg, Ph.D.
                 Thesis Advisor

                 Stanley B. Supinski, Ph.D.
                 Thesis Co-Advisor

                 Daniel Moran, Ph.D.
                 Chair, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

Scholarly literature and anecdotal reports have long suggested that the Americans lack the language skills and cultural competence to carry out the Nation's business effectively, in both the public and the private sectors, despite almost 75 years of federal support for cross-cultural and language education. This study sought to answer the questions whether there is in fact a problem; if so, why; and whether a national strategy for global education could contribute to the solution of the problem. Semi-structured interviews were held with a convenience sample of respondents connected with the intelligence, defense, diplomatic, and academic communities, and the private sector, and the results transcribed and coded thematically. Results were supplemented by relevant literature. Although the results were not unanimous, the respondents generally agreed that improvements in global education were critical to national and homeland security, including the Nation's ability to remain competitive in an increasingly global economy, and that a national strategy would be a useful tool for providing the necessary political leadership and public education. The respondents also offered preliminary thoughts on how a national strategy might be developed, what goals it might seek to achieve, and issues to be considered in planning.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Americans are famously ignorant of foreign languages and foreign cultures. This remains true despite almost three-quarters of a century's federal sponsorship of multiple foreign-language and other international-study programs. A good deal of recent literature reports anecdotally that the United States simply does not have enough citizens with the skills needed to carry out critical tasks related to homeland security, such as counterintelligence, border protection, and law enforcement; and that this deficit places the Nation at a competitive disadvantage in international trade and public diplomacy. The only published, academically rigorous study of the question, carried out by the National Research Council, refrains from concluding that there is a "shortage" of skilled job candidates because it did not first conduct a needs assessment; but it acknowledges that the "significant demand" for people with these skills "suggests that there is a significant unmet need." This study sought to answer the following questions: (1) Have existing education programs in fact failed to meet the Nation's needs? If so, why? (2) Would the development and implementation of a national strategy for global education contribute to a solution of the problem? (3) If so, how can a national strategy be developed and what should its goals be?

A review of the existing literature suggested that existing federal programs have indeed failed to produce a skilled workforce sufficient to fill the Nation's needs in government at all levels, the private sector, and civil society. Several reasons were assigned. First, a number of writers argued that a successful education program requires coherent and unified strategy and management. Existing language and cultural-skills programs in the United States lack the requisite focus and structure. Second, education programs in practical language and cultural skills are significantly underfunded in the United States (even in comparison with other education programs, such as those for the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics).   Third, the content and

methodology of intercultural studies programs are politically controversial, particularly when addressing subjects or issues touching on current events (e.g., teaching about Islam or about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict).

To test these largely anecdotal reports, semi-structured interviews were held with a convenience sample of respondents holding senior positions in the defense, diplomatic, and intelligence communities, federal and state law enforcement, the academic world, and the private sector. Respondents were promised anonymity, and provided their personal views, not necessarily the official views of their employers. The sample was small, and not necessarily representative. While the respondents certainly were not unanimous in their views, certain consistent themes emerged during the interviews that confirmed much (but not all) of the information in the literature. This suggests that there may be a degree of validity in the responses greater than what is suggested by statistical considerations of sample size, random selection of respondents, etc.

What's the Problem?

The great majority (75%) of respondents said that there was a shortage of people with the skills needed to conduct the nation's business. Two respondents said there were insufficient data to answer the question. One said there was not a shortage of qualified individuals, but that government agencies had insufficient resources to hire the number of people needed to carry out their missions.

The respondent who said there was no shortage of people with language and cultural skills was speaking specifically about the needs of the Foreign Service. It should be noted, however, that the Foreign Service provides its own, widely respected language training to its officers within the cultural context of the area of assignment. Further, using a process validated by an organizational psychologist, it screens applicants for "cultural adaptability" in the course of its recruiting process. It does not rely on the nation's education system to produce candidates with language training and cultural skills. Those who said the question could not fairly be answered said data were lacking in two areas: there is insufficient information to describe the Nation's needs, and no reliable data to describe the available talent pool or the output of education or agency

training programs. However, these respondents agreed that more resources should be devoted to the development of language skills and cultural education and training.

The remaining respondents agreed that there was a need to provide the American population with better education in foreign-language skills and knowledge of other cultures. Their reasons for thinking so are closely entwined with their views on the gravity of the problem, assessments of which tended to break down along occupational lines. Respondents from the law enforcement community generally felt that the needs of their own and similar agencies were not critically underserved, although supporting services could be improved. Respondents from the diplomatic, intelligence, and defense communities felt that they had critical needs that were not being met, with consequences that were sometimes serious. Respondents from the academic world and the commercial sector felt that these skills were essential to American success in a variety of endeavors, and that the U.S. education system is not producing graduates who possessed these skills.

When asked why there is a problem, none of the respondents spontaneously identified lack of a strategic vision or plan as a problem; when asked, however, 75% said that some form of national strategy could improve the situation. Many of the respondents also cited lack of funding, but the issues extended beyond education into staffing and compensation models. Political controversy, though featuring prominently in the literature, did not seem to be a serious concern for most of the respondents; rather, gaining sufficient political influence to acquire the necessary resources and leadership was a larger concern. There were also concerns specific to government agencies, the education community, and the private sector. Finally, there was concern that there is presently insufficient public understanding of the need for devoting further resources to global education.

Would a National Strategy Help?

Most respondents thought that a national strategy, properly crafted and executed, could help address these needs. One respondent did not express a view, two were uncertain, and one thought a national strategy would be undesirable. All of the respondents felt, however, that matters could be improved with strong national leadership

publicly stating the need for better education in this area and discussing the benefits that improved education would bring. Even the respondent who opposed a national strategy felt that strong leadership could inspire Americans to bring about change for the national good.

The arguments both for and against the adoption of a national strategy were based on largely pragmatic considerations. The arguments in favor reflected a judgment that there is an unfulfilled need that previous efforts have failed to satisfy; concern that the nation is failing to maintain its competitive position in both economic and security terms; and a desire to rationalize compensation and reduce competition for resources in the public sector. The arguments against reflected doubt about the value of centralized planning, uncertainty about the ability or willingness of diverse constituencies to agree on goals, doubt whether a national strategy was needed to bring about change, and questions about the allocation of resources.

Many of the arguments against a national strategy seemed to be based on the assumption that a national strategy would necessarily entail a centralized decision maker with control of all resources and the power to impose goals and priorities. There is, however, a different model: that of the National Strategy for Homeland Security and its related documents (e.g., the National Infrastructure Protection Plan, its Sector-Specific Plans, and their Annexes). Recognizing that some 85% of the Nation's critical infrastructure and key resources are privately owned, the National Strategy for Homeland Security envisions a process in which decision-making authority is diffused among government agencies at all levels, the private sector, and institutions of civil society such as the Red Cross, within an overarching framework of general goals and coordinating structures. This model of cross-sector cooperation, even when the stakeholders have divergent objectives, is described in detail in the literature discussing "megacommunities."

How Can We Develop a National Strategy?

The respondents largely agreed that the necessary preconditions for improvement are (a) the education of all Americans about the need for improvement and (b) the ability

to demonstrate a resulting, bottom-line gain. Most felt that a national strategy, supported by the President and carried out under the leadership of a widely respected public figure, would be a good vehicle for achieving the desired ends.

Based on interviews with the respondents, I concluded that the model most likely to be successful was not a centralized decision-making process, but one in which the authority to make decisions and the resources to support them were widely distributed, because of the diversity of stakeholders and the divergence of their interests. As already noted, this is the "megacommunity" model, of which the National Strategy for Homeland Security is a current and apparently successful example.

Most respondents believed that before the Nation was willing to devote the effort and resources to developing and implementing a national strategy, some leadership of national stature would be needed to educate the public and other stakeholders about the importance of global education and the economic and security benefits to be derived from improving global education in the United States. For that purpose, leaders would ideally be recruited from government, the private sector, and civil society; it is entirely possible that the impetus for this effort would have to come from the private sector. Once a more favorable political climate was established, various stakeholders could be engaged to develop a more concrete approach to the problem.

What Should Be the Goals of a National Strategy?

From interviews with the respondents I extrapolated the following vision statement for a national strategy for global education:

> The United States will work with partners at all levels of government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and individuals, to ensure that its citizens acquire the language skills and cultural competence needed to engage with other countries in pursuit of the security and prosperity of the Nation.

In support of that broad vision, the respondents offered the following goals for a national strategy:

1. Ensure that all students in the U.S. educational system have the opportunity to receive an education that permits them to acquire the skills needed to meet the Nation's needs.

2. Accurately project what language and cultural skills the Nation's workforce will need in all sectors on a continuing basis.

Further, the respondents offered several considerations in connection with how these goals might be achieved:

3. Education and training must focus not only on language skills, but on cultural competence as well.

4. In projecting future needs for language and cultural skills, analysts must bear in mind both the needs of government and those of the private sector, including those who constitute the U.S. workforce.

5. There are some existing federal institutions that function effectively to provide global education or cross-cultural research. A national strategy should interfere as little as possible with those institutions.

6. In order to ensure that Americans understand the benefits, and take advantage, of improved global education programs, there may need to be some visible, tangible benefits to provide incentives for participation in language and cultural education.

In addition, the respondents raised two important practical considerations that fell somewhere between goals and methods:

7. Language training should begin as early as practical because (a) the acquisition of new language and related skills takes time, (b) children generally find it easier to learn languages than adults, and (c) people who have learned more than one language generally find it easier to acquire additional languages than those who have not.

8. Ideally, education in a foreign language and culture will include direct exposure to that language and culture in its native environment.

Finally, there were two critical conditions for the success of a national strategy. First, as noted above, the goals cannot be determined solely by the federal government, even taking into consideration the interest of other stakeholders. The authority to decide what languages will be taught, and how, must be devolved to other interested parties, in much the same way that private industry under the National Infrastructure Protection Plan is expected to perform its own risk assessments and take appropriate protective measures

in consultation with its partners in business, civil society, and all levels of government. Second, the difficult decision must be made to allocate resources to building a national capacity for global education. The United States failed for many years to devote adequate resources to maintaining its physical infrastructure, and is now paying an increased cost as transportation, manufacturing, and energy systems, for example, become increasingly obsolescent, stressed, and prone to costly failures or inability to compete with newer structures and technologies. The United States is already at a relative disadvantage to other countries in the field of global education. The longer we wait to improve our global education programs, the more urgent the need will become, the longer it will take us to catch up, and the more it will cost.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AID	Agency for International Development
CED	Committee for Economic Development
CHDS	Center for Homeland Defense and Security
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
DEA	Drug Enforcement Administration
DG	Director General
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DNI	Director of National Intelligence
DoD	Department of Defense
EU	European Union
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FCS	Foreign Commercial Service
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
GAO	Government Accountability Office (formerly the General Accounting Office)
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
IACP	International Association of Chiefs of Police
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIMS	National Incident Management System
NIPP	National Infrastructure Protection Plan
NOBLE	National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives
NPS	Naval Postgraduate School
NRF	National Response Framework
NSA	National Security Agency
ODNI	Office of the Director of National Intelligence
QHSR	Quadrennial Homeland Security Review
SCI	Sensitive Compartmented Information

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ex nihilo nihil fit. This study was inspired by the work of Paul W. Conner, Ph.D. (1937–1984), an American historian and educator who devoted much of his too-brief career to providing American undergraduates with opportunities for self-directed, independent, comparative cross-cultural research at home and abroad. Dr. Conner believed that intercultural studies and understanding were critical to a secure and prosperous future for America and the world—a view shared by many of the respondents in this study.

I owe a great debt of thanks to those respondents for their generosity with their time and the candor with which they expressed their views. It was clear throughout the interviews that all of them had given substantial thought to the questions addressed in this paper. If they did not claim to have all the answers, they certainly did a great deal to help me understand the issues, and to see some ways in which they might be resolved.

One of the professed goals of the Center for Homeland Defense and Security is to bring some academic rigor to the study of homeland security. My cohort consisted of students drawn from federal, state, and local governments, from whom I learned much about not only the substance of the subjects we studied, but also the differing perspectives that different stakeholders brought to those subjects. Between the intellectual demands of the faculty and the practical expertise of my classmates, I found the program to be an extraordinary learning opportunity. I am grateful to have been allowed to participate in it. I am particularly grateful to my supervisor at the Transportation Security Administration, Assistant Chief Counsel Donna Bivona, for her support and understanding while I was away from the office in classes, or pursuing my research and writing this thesis.

Anders Strindberg, Ph.D., and Stan Supinski, Ph.D., were my thesis advisors. They showed remarkable patience (not to say self-restraint!) throughout the surprisingly extended period during which I wrote this thesis. I appreciated their forbearance, their good humor, their encouragement, and their advice.

Finally, I acknowledge with thanks and deep affection the contributions of my wife, Laura George, D.S.W., M.A. Without her belief in me, her support, her good counsel, and her love, I could never have completed this paper. As Eugene O'Neill wrote to his wife, Carlotta, in the dedication of *Long Day's Journey Into Night,* "You know my gratitude. And my love!"

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PROBLEM STATEMENT

"Scholars have long known that most Americans are woefully ignorant of foreign affairs."[1] Not only that, they are more so than citizens of other developed countries.[2] The availability of a vast amount of information via the traditional news media, 24-hour cable news, and the internet has not improved Americans' knowledge of current affairs since the late 1980s.[3]

The consequences of this ignorance are widely felt. The Partnership for Public Service reported in 2006 that shortages of skilled language-qualified personnel "are complicating the government's efforts in trade, peacekeeping, diplomacy, security and intelligence."[4] The Committee for Economic Development (CED) observed that the lack of language and other cultural skills has impaired the Nation's ability to conduct increasingly needed public diplomacy, prosecute the battle against terrorism, and otherwise support the national security.[5] GAO has reported and testified forcefully about

---

[1] Stephen Earl Bennett, et al., "Citizens' Knowledge of Foreign Affairs," *Harvard Journal of Press/Politics* 1, no. 2 (1996): 10.

[2] Ibid. (Americans rank last in knowledge of international affairs when compared with citizens of Canada, France, Germany, and Great Britain); James Curran, et al., "Media System, Public Knowledge and Democracy: A Comparative Study," *European Journal of Communication* 24, no. 1 (2009): 5 (Americans rank below Britons, Finns, and Danes on knowledge of international *and* domestic news; least significant difference was in average percentage of correct answers to questions concerning domestic "soft" news, i.e., celebrities, human interest, sport, and other entertainment); House Committee on Education and the Workforce, *International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003,* 108th Cong., 1st Sess., 2003, H.R. Rep. 308 ("Young Americans are next to last in their knowledge of geography and international affairs compared with students from eight other industrial countries.").

[3] Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, "What Americans Know: 1989–2007 – Public Knowledge of Current Affairs Little Changed by News and Information Revolutions," Pew Research Center, http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/319.pdf (accessed October 27, 2011).

[4] Partnership for Public Service, *Foreign Language Skills,* Issue Brief No. PPS-06-02 (Washington: Partnership for Public Service, 2006).

[5] Research & Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development ("CED"), *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 8–10.

the problems this has created, stating that the shortages of qualified staff "have adversely affected agency operations and hindered U.S. military, law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism, and diplomatic efforts."[6]

Among other things, the Department of Homeland Security and its components lack a comprehensive plan to assess their needs and acquire personnel with the language and cultural skills needed to carry out critical missions related to homeland security.[7] The Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community are suffering from a shortage of military translators and interpreters, cryptologic linguists, and human intelligence officers.[8] These needs are particularly crucial in active military action zones: as General David Petraeus said of his time commanding the 101st Airborne Division in Iraq, "We had terrific situational awareness; what we lacked was cultural awareness."[9] The intelligence community is also unable to carry out its mission fully because of the shortage of personnel with the requisite skills.[10] There is likewise a shortage of U.S. diplomatic and consular officers with adequate language skills, which interferes with -the conduct of diplomacy, increases the incidence of visa fraud, and impairs badly needed public diplomacy efforts.[11] It is expected that this problem will get worse.[12] Domestic law enforcement and counterterrorism are also hindered by the lack of foreign-language

---

[6] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls,* No. GAO-02-375 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2002), 2 ("*Foreign Languages* I.").

[7] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Department of Homeland Security: DHS Needs to Comprehensively Assess Its Foreign Language Needs and Capabilities and Identify Shortfalls,* No. GAO-10-714 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2010), 9–27.

[8] GAO, *Foreign Languages* I*,* 7–9.

[9] Ibid., 10. The Army is attempting to remedy this deficit by attaching anthropologists to military units. David Rohde, "Army Enlists Anthropology in War Zones," *New York Times,* October 5, 2007, national edition; *see* Montgomery McFate, "The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture," *Joint Forces Quarterly,* no. 38 (2005), 42–48. This practice is controversial; some academic anthropologists believe that the use of anthropology to support a military effort is unethical. *See, e.g.,* Network of Concerned Anthropologists, *Pledge of Non-participation in Counterinsurgency,* http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com/home (accessed October 27, 2011). Others believe that it is a legitimate way of avoiding unnecessary bloodshed.

[10] GAO, *Foreign Languages* I, 14. GAO, *Department of State: Staffing and Foreign Language Shortfalls Persist Despite Initiatives to Address Gaps,* No. GAO-06-894 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2006), 31.

[11] Ibid*.,* 30–31.

[12] Partnership for Public Service, *op. cit.*

and intercultural skills among federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies.[13] The
FBI reports that it has had difficulties building health-care fraud cases, convicting violent
gang members, and analyzing audiotapes and written materials obtained in
counterterrorism operations.[14]

Finally, the lack of intercultural skills may pose problems in America's diverse
and multicultural society. The nation relies increasingly on immigrant labor, educates a
growing school population of children who speak languages other than English at home,
hosts thousands of exchange students, university undergraduates, and graduate students
from overseas, and participates in a full range of touristic and international cultural
pursuits.[15] The resulting cross-cultural misunderstandings have impeded the assimilation
of immigrants, caused problems with law enforcement, and have occasionally led to
serious incidents.[16]

In short, there are many good reasons for improving global education in the
United States.[17] Four major federal programs, enacted over a period of more than 40
years, have tried to meet the need.[18] On the evidence, they have failed to do so.

B.   RESEARCH QUESTION

How can the United States enhance homeland security by improving the foreign-
language and intercultural skills of American citizens generally?

---

[13] For example, GAO recounts an incident, captured on videotape, in which a Texas law enforcement officer began to interview four Spanish-speaking individuals during a routine traffic stop. The four suspects exited the car and began to converse in Spanish among themselves. The officer had difficulty understanding what they were saying. "Seconds later, the four individuals attacked the officer, took his gun, and shot the officer to death." GAO, *Department of Homeland Security,* 18.

[14] GAO, *Foreign Languages* I, 14.

[15] CED, *op. cit.,* 10–11.

[16] "Grief Spans Sea as Gun Ends a Life Mistakenly," *New York Times,* October 21, 1992, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E0CEFDD163BF932A15753C1A964958260 (accessed October 27, 2011).

[17] By "global education" I mean a combination of education in foreign-language skills (both oral and written) and cultural competence (meaning the ability to adapt to a foreign culture and work effectively within it or with those raised in it).

[18] These are the Fulbright-Hays Act, 22 U.S.C. §§ 2451-2464; Title VI of the Higher Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1121-1132; the David L. Boren National Security Education Act, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1901-1912; and the Foreign Language Incentive and Assistance Programs, 20 U.S.C. §§ 7259-7259c.

(a) Since 1961, Congress has enacted several major federal programs that support language and area education. It is widely perceived that these have not met the nation's needs. Is this true? If so, why?

(b) If there is a problem, would a national strategy for global education contribute to its solution?

(c) How could a national strategy be developed?

(d) What goals should a national strategy seek to achieve?

C.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The published literature clearly shows that the federal government has supported foreign language and other international studies for more than 70 years. Notwithstanding a long history of support for international education, however, existing federal programs have failed to meet the nation's needs for a workforce with adequate language and intercultural skills, in either the public sector or the private sector. Although many observers have commented on the lack of language and intercultural skills in the U.S. workforce, few have considered in an academically rigorous manner the reasons for the failure of existing programs. It is nonetheless possible to infer from the literature some possible reasons for the failure. These include (1) lack of an overarching strategy and unified management, (2) inadequate funding, and (3) political controversy over the content of an educational program. These inferences are discussed below.

1.   The Federal Government Has Supported Foreign Language and Other International Studies for More than Seventy Years

Formal federal support for cross-cultural study appears to have begun in 1938, when Congress authorized and the State Department began coordinating scientific and cultural exchange programs with Latin American countries.[19] More systematic programs gathered support after World War II, beginning with the Fulbright Act of 1946, which

---

[19] Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948,* 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1948, S. Rep. 811, *reprinted in* 1948 U.S. Code, Cong'l & Admin. News 1011, 1012 ("S. Rep. 80–811").

authorized educational exchange programs in schools and institutions of higher education;[20] the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, which established the U.S. Information Agency and authorized further exchange programs;[21] and the Fulbright-Hays Act (1961), which led the establishment of numerous educational funding, exchange, and other programs.[22]

The primary purpose of these programs appears to have been the conduct of public diplomacy—that is, to foster good opinion of the United States abroad and to counteract hostile propaganda.[23] With the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, there appears to have been a shift in emphasis: with that and later legislation, Congress began to provide the means for educating Americans to meet the needs of the nation.[24] Section 602 of the Act may have been the first specific authorization for federal support of area and intercultural studies. This trend continued in the International Education Act of 1966, which authorized the enhancement of undergraduate programs and the establishment of advanced graduate centers for international study; [25] the Education Amendments Act of 1980, which created "Title VI" programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 that significantly expanded federal support for global educational programs including international business programs,[26] and which included an International Understanding Act intended to make available to American students "the information which will enable them to make informed judgments with respect to the international policies and actions of the United States";[27] the David L.

---

[20] "Fulbright Act of 1946," An Act to Amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Pub. L. No. 79–584, 60 Stat. 754.

[21] "Smith-Mundt Act of 1948," U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Pub. L. No. 80–402, 62 Stat. 9.

[22] "Fulbright-Hays Act," Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Pub. L. No. 87–256, § 101, 75 Stat. 527, *codified at* 22 U.S.C. § 2451.

[23] Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948,* 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1948, S. Rep. 811, 1011, 1013.

[24] National Defense Education Act of 1958, Pub. L. No. 85–864, § 101, 72 Stat. 1580.

[25] International Education Act of 1966, §§ 2, 101–102, 80 Stat. 1066.

[26] Education Amendments Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96–374, § 601(a), 94 Stat. 1367, *codified at* 20 U.S.C. §§ 1121–1132.

[27] Ibid.*,* § 601(b), *amending* the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89–10, Title II, 79 Stat. 27.

Boren National Security Act of 1991, which authorized scholarships, fellowships, and grants to promote studies in areas and languages of strategic interest;[28] and the Foreign Language Assistance Act of 2001, which supports language studies in primary and secondary schools.[29]

In summary, for almost three-quarters of a century the nation has experimented with various programs to advance the national interest by giving Americans educational opportunities to acquire knowledge of foreign cultures and languages. So far, we have had limited success.

2.   **Existing Programs Have Failed to Meet National Requirements for Citizens With Language and Cross-Cultural Skills Adequate to Meet the Needs of Public Service and Commerce.**

Notwithstanding the existence of multiple federal programs to foster language, area, and other cultural studies, both government and the private sector find themselves unable to satisfy their needs for U.S. citizens with the qualifications necessary to carry out the nation's business. In January 2002, the Government Accountability Office (GAO)[30] reviewed staffing levels of language-skilled personnel at the U.S. Army, the Foreign Service (Dept. of State), the Foreign Commercial Service (Dept. of Commerce), and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; it found that shortages of translators, interpreters, and other staff with critical foreign language skills "have adversely affected agency operations and hindered U.S. military, law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism, and diplomatic efforts."[31] In this public report, GAO also stated, without elaboration, that the National Security Agency was suffering similar problems.[32]

---

[28] David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102–183, § 801(b)(4), 105 Stat. 1271, *codified at* 50 U.S.C. §§ 1901(b)(4), 1902(a). The Act is Title VIII of the Intelligence Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1992.

[29] Foreign Language Assistance Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, § 501, 115 Stat. 1425, 1839–1841, *codified at* 20 U.S.C. §§ 7259–7259c. The Act is Title V, Part D, Subpart 9 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, *amending* the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, §§ 5491–5494.

[30] Formerly the General Accounting Office.

[31] U.S. General Accounting Office. *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls,* Report No. GAO–02–375 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2002), 1–2, 13–15.

[32] Ibid., 1 note 1.

As recently as September 2009, GAO reported that the Foreign Service continued to suffer shortfalls in staffing positions requiring certain language skills, despite a five-year program designed to remedy staffing deficiencies and meet anticipated needs. This deficiency facilitates visa fraud, impedes economic negotiations and the development of political contacts, hampers the conduct of public diplomacy, and interferes with the collection of human intelligence, embassy security, and employee morale.[33] Alarmingly, in 2005, "the Director General of the Foreign Service indicated . . . that 60% of the State Department's critical language speakers are eligible to retire in five years."[34] This is roughly twice the retirement eligibility rate of the federal workforce generally.[35]

Similarly, GAO reported in June 2009 that the Department of Defense had taken steps to meet its needs for personnel with language skills and "regional proficiency" (elsewhere described as "cultural awareness capabilities"[36]), but still had not yet either determined its requirements and shortfalls or developed a strategic plan to acquire the needed resources.[37] Other federal agencies that serve domestic populations with limited English proficiency, such as the Department of Homeland Security (specifically including the Federal Emergency Management Agency), are taking steps to improve services in foreign languages; but in the view of GAO need to develop and implement

---

[33] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Department of State: Comprehensive Plan Needed to Address Persistent Foreign Language Shortfalls,* No. GAO-09-955 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2009), 3–5, 13–16.

[34] Partnership for Public Service. "Foreign Language Skills," Issue Brief No. PPS-06-02 (May 1, 2006). Partnership for Public Service, http://www.ourpublicservice.org/OPS/publications/download.php?id=41.

[35] A report published by OPM in March 2008 showed that the cumulative percentage of full-time, permanent, federal employees eligible to retire would not reach 60% until the end of fiscal year 2016, *ten* years after the starting point of FYE 2006. U.S. Office of Personnel Management, *An Analysis of Federal Employee Retirement Data: Predicting Future Retirements and Examining Factors Relevant to Retiring from Federal Service* (Washington: Office of Personnel Management, 2008), 3–4, http://www.opm.gov/feddata/RetirementPaperFinal_v4.pdf (accessed October 27, 2011).

[36] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Defense Management: Preliminary Observations on DOD's Language and Cultural Awareness Capabilities,* No. GAO-09-176R (Washington, DC: Government Accountability Office, 2008), http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09176r.pdf (accessed October 27, 2011).

[37] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Military Training: DOD Needs a Strategic Plan and Better Inventory and Requirements Data to Guide Development of Language Skills and Regional Proficiency,* No. GAO-09-568 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2009).

plans to serve foreign-language clients, monitor and evaluate their success, and work more closely on identifying common outcomes, establishing coordinated strategies, and making better use of each other's resources.[38]

Finally, in October 2009, the FBI's Office of Inspector General reported that FBI had not reviewed 31% of the electronic files and 25% of the audio material that it had collected for counterterrorism, counterintelligence, and criminal investigative operations in fiscal years 2006 through 2008;[39] that 28% of the unreviewed electronic files and 99% of the unreviewed audio and text collections were in a foreign language;[40] and that the failure to review this material was attributable in part to FBI's inability to meet hiring goals for linguists and in part to the linguists' lack of adequate training,[41] among other reasons. In consequence, FBI's backlog of unreviewed material increased between fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2008, even in its highest priority counterintelligence and counterterrorism cases.[42]

The problem is not unique to the public sector. In 2006, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) observed that knowledge of foreign languages and cultures has become an economic necessity for U.S. business, but that U.S. students generally lack the cross-cultural skills of their foreign peers.[43] Nor is the deficiency limited to lack of language skills. "Many corporations, especially multinationals, tend to emphasize cultural competence more than foreign language skills . The cross-cultural

---

[38] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Language Access: Selected Agencies Can Improve Services to Limited English Proficient Persons,* No. GAO-10-91 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2010).

[39] Office of Inspector General, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, *The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Foreign Language Translation Program,* Audit Report No. 10-02 (October 2009), 15–17, http://www.justice.gov/oig/reports/FBI/a1002_redacted.pdf (accessed October 27, 2011). *Also see* House Committee on the Judiciary, *Recent Inspector General Reports Concerning the FBI: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security,* 111th Cong., 2d Sess., February 24, 2010, Serial No. 111–102, 12–82, http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/111th/111-102_55067.PDF (accessed October 27, 2011).

[40] Ibid*.,* 45–46.

[41] Ibid*.,* 72, 81–83.

[42] Ibid*.,* 45–46.

[43] Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development, *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 6–8.

competence that is needed to succeed in the business world may require a combination of foreign language skills, international knowledge, and international experience."[44]

Officially, at least, the Department of Education takes pride in what has been accomplished with the support of programs authorized under Fulbright-Hays Act and Title VI of the Higher Education Act.[45] But the weight of scholarly and official opinion is that the nation has not done nearly enough. The failure clearly affects homeland security. The question is why so many years of federal efforts have failed to meet the nation's needs.

3.   **There Are Several Possible Reasons for the Failure of Federal Educational Initiatives to Meet the Nation's Needs for an Interculturally Competent Workforce**

Many observers have commented on the nation's failure to educate an interculturally competent workforce. There appears, however, to be only one published, academically rigorous and comprehensive review of existing programs' performance.[46] Without addressing the *reasons* for the failure, however, a number of writers have suggested *solutions* from which the reader can reasonably infer the writers' opinions on the nature of the problem. The several reasons for failure that can be inferred from the literature are not mutually inconsistent; in fact, each may well contribute to the failure of the efforts made to date. They are: (a) the lack of a comprehensive strategy and a unified management; (b) inadequate funding; and (c) the political sensitivity of international education.

A 2007 report, prepared by a special committee of the National Research Council at the request of the U.S. Department of Education, addressed eight key areas of concern

---

[44] Research and Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development, *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 7–8.

[45] Sarah T. Beaton, "The Federal Role in International Business Education," *Thunderbird International Business Review* 43, no. 2 (March–April 2001): 289–302.

[46] Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, National Research Council, *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future,* Mary Ellen O'Connell and Janet L. Norwood, eds. (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2007).

identified by Congress in connection with programs authorized by Title VI of the Higher Education Act and the education component of the Fulbright-Hays Act. That report, entitled *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future,* is recent, directly relevant to the subject of the present study, and apparently unique in its breadth.

The concerns expressed by Congress included, among others: "infusing" foreign language and area studies throughout the education system and across disciplines, including professional education; conducting public outreach and dissemination of information to all levels of the educational system (beginning with elementary schools), the media, government, business, and the public; reducing shortages of foreign language and area experts; addressing business needs for international knowledge and foreign language skills; and increasing the numbers of underrepresented minorities in international service.[47] The report begins by summarizing the history of Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays Act and their implementation, and discussing the national need for intercultural and language skills. It then addresses each of the eight areas of Congressional concern, reviewing the programs' performance in each area, summarizing the current status where possible, and making recommendations for how to remedy deficiencies.[48] The final section of the report, "Important Next Steps," discusses both immediate "issues related to program implementation, monitoring, and evaluation," and "needed strategic actions as the programs look toward future challenges and opportunities."[49]

Among other things, the report noted the lack of priority given to language and cultural instruction; the fragmentation of programs; the lack of a unifying plan or strategic vision; the lack of a systematic process for assessing national needs and

---

[47] Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, National Research Council, *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future,* Mary Ellen O'Connell and Janet L. Norwood, eds. (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2007), 24.

[48] As the report points out in its review of data provided by the Department of Education (ED) and the conclusions previously published studies, "These different conclusions drawn from the same data highlight the difficulties in interpreting these sorts of figures without a comparison group or a definition and rationale by ED of what would constitute success." *International Education and Foreign Languages,* 119.

[49] Ibid., 209.

developing approaches to address them; the need for additional resources to develop "an integrated and articulated approach in multiple systems, including K-12, higher education, and business"; and the need to increase minority representation in certain programs.[50] The report thus echoes and corroborates some of the themes found in the other published literature. Those themes are discussed further below.

<blockquote>

a. A Successful Educational Program Requires Coherent and Unified Strategy and Management, Which Federal International Educational Programs Lack

</blockquote>

The lack of an overarching strategy and management has been a persistent theme in the scholarly and professional literature of language and intercultural education, at least in recent years. The concern arises from the perspective of the academy, the business sector, and national defense. Two years before the National Research Council issued its report, for example, the military intelligence community reached out to the educational and industrial sectors to help develop guidance for setting national priorities for foreign language and intercultural education.[51] Recommendations were made for the Executive Branch, Congress, state and local governments, the academic community, and the private sector. These included Presidential emphasis on language and cultural studies including the appointment of a special advisor to the President for language and cultural awareness; the establishment of a national language policy; requiring language proficiency skills across academic disciplines; providing incentives for study abroad; and public-private partnerships to provide increased education and employment opportunities, including internships, for persons with appropriate foreign language or other international skills.

The academic community offers similar views. The elements of the policy envisioned by two major professional associations of U.S. foreign-study organizations

---

[50] As the report points out in its review of data provided by the Department of Education (ED) and the conclusions previously published studies, "These different conclusions drawn from the same data highlight the difficulties in interpreting these sorts of figures without a comparison group or a definition and rationale by ED of what would constitute success." *International Education and Foreign Languages,* 4–5.

[51] Peter A. Shaver, "Language Action Update: Notes from the Military Language Conference, Foreign Language and Culture: Force Multipliers, 8 to 9 November 2005," *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin* 31, no. 3 (July–Sept. 2005): 59–61.

are: the promotion of international, foreign-language, and area studies; a comprehensive strategy to position the United States as "a magnet for international students and scholars"; and a comprehensive strategy to establish study abroad as an integral component of undergraduate education.[52] The need for such a policy is stated in terms of the ability both to compete economically in an increasingly global economy and to protect national security.[53]

Finally, the business community has expressed concerns not only for global economic competitiveness and the national security, but also for the preservation of an American society that "is, and will continue to be, characterized by ethnic and linguistic diversity."[54] To meet these challenges, the Committee for Economic Development recommended in 2006: (a) "that international content be taught across the curriculum and at all levels of learning, to expand American students' knowledge of other countries and cultures"; (b) that language training be increased at every level of education, especially in "critical," less-commonly taught languages; and (c) that national -leaders, including politicians, the media, and the commercial and philanthropic communities, "inform the public about the importance of improving education in foreign languages and international studies."[55]

---

[52] NAFSA: Association of International Educators and Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, "An International Education Policy for U.S. Leadership, Competitiveness, and Security" (October 2007). NAFSA, http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/united_states_international (accessed November 14, 2011).

[53] Ibid., 1. Also see, for example: (a) Burton Bollag, "A Failure to Communicate," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 27, 2007), A24; (b) William D. Hunter, "Got Global Competency?" *International Educator* 13, no. 2 (Spring 2004), 6–9; and (c) Anne C. Lewis, "Language Learning and National Security," *Phi Delta Kappan,* October 2007, 84–85.

[54] Research & Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development, *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 5–11.

[55] Research & Policy Committee, Committee for Economic Development, *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 26–29. These recommendations notably mirror those of the 2005 report of the Military Language Conference.

b. The Federal Government Has Provided Inadequate Funding for Existing Programs

Informed observers have noted for over a quarter-century that lack of adequate support and funding were harming U.S. language and intercultural programs. It was noted in 1981 that the Fulbright Program's "real budget is but 60% of what it was in 1965." [56] The author added that "less than ten percent of American colleges and universities require foreign language training, compared to 34% in 1966 and 85% in 1915," and that "[t]here are reportedly more teachers of English in the Soviet Union now than there are students of Russian in the United States" (emphasis original).

More recent observers seem to agree that federal programs for language, area, and inter-cultural studies remain badly underfunded. In 2002, William Gray, III (who had been Chairman of the House Budget Committee and later became President of the United Negro College Fund) stated that "the United States has fallen considerably short in bridging the gap between voicing support for international education and committing resources to make studying abroad an integral part of the college experience."[57] His observation was borne out by later developments: in the budget for fiscal year 2005, the Foreign Language Assistance Program was unfunded and Title VI programs were funded at a lower level than was provided in fiscal year 2003.[58] Worse, the political will to fund such programs was seen to fall away. [59]

The national defense community agreed that these studies were critical to the national security and should be better funded. Several of the recommendations of the 2005 Military Language Conference called for funding and authority to increase language

---

[56] Kenneth L. Adelman, "Speaking of America: Public Diplomacy in Our Time," *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 925–927.

[57] Tony Washington, "UNCF Chief Makes Case for National Policy on International Education," *Black Issues in Higher Education* 19, no. 10 (July 4, 2002): 12.

[58] Lee Wilberschied, "Foreign Language Assistance Program At Risk," Washington Report: Language News from the Nation's Capital. *Foreign Language Annals* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 160.

[59] Robert A. Scott, "Many Calls, Little Action: Global Illiteracy in the United States," *The Presidency* 8, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 19.

education in the public elementary and secondary schools, provide scholarships at the university level, recruit and sponsor foreign language teachers, and provide grants for education.[60]

As late as 2007, scholars continued to express deep concern over the lack of fiscal support for Fulbright-Hays and Title VI programs. "Taking inflation into account, the amount for both programs is 30% less than in 1967."[61] The National Research Council observed that funding for these programs has not kept pace with the expansion in their mission (at least in constant dollars), and that additional funding is needed to address program deficiencies.[62]

c. The Content and Methodology of Intercultural Studies Programs Are Politically Controversial

> Existing federal funding [for international education] is threatened further not only by tax cuts, but also by attitudes similar to those expressed a hundred years ago: The study of foreign languages and culture is somehow anti-American.[63]

— Robert Scott, President of Adelphi University (2005).

Scott's observation reflects a current and recurrent theme in the political debate over the funding and content of language, area, and related studies: that the study of other languages and cultures is in some way subversive. The interests that are being subverted, however, depend largely on the political bias of the observer. The political right appears to fear that the academy's insistence on academic freedom is meant to advance an agenda of indoctrinating American students with anti-American, anti-democratic, and specifically anti-government views. The political left appears to fear that the government's desire to tie public funding to measurable benefits for the national interest cloaks an intention to dictate the content of instructional materials and to censor

---

[60] Shaver, "Language Action Update," 60.

[61] Bollag, "A Failure to Communicate."

[62] Nat'l Research Council, Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, 3–4, 32–34.

[63] Robert A. Scott, *op cit.,* 19.

the expression of views that conflict with Administration policies. The education establishment is engaged in a lively debate over terminology. These concerns interfere with the formation of a political consensus that would permit the adoption of the reforms necessary for a successful program of foreign language, area, and cultural studies.

The academic establishment has expressed concern about the politicization of language and area studies for half a century. "When the National Defense Education Act was first implemented in 1958–59, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, registered dismay that an education bill had to be linked to defense."[64] Over 30 years later, with the enactment of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991, "it [was] easy to imagine how Hutchins would have reacted to legislation that, beyond linking education with security, situate[d] a national education program in the Department of Defense with oversight vested in" a board chaired by the Secretary of Defense and consisting of the Secretaries of Education and Commerce, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and four academics from relevant disciplines appointed by the President.[65] The academic community expressed particular anxiety about the foreign perception that program participants might be connected with the defense and intelligence establishments, and this concern was echoed in Congress—which nonetheless enacted the legislation.[66] The same concern was also shared by some in the intelligence community. As one former CIA senior estimates officer asked, "How do you explain to foreign ministries of education, to universities that in many countries are traditionally anti-establishment, and to student groups frequently suspicious of American motives that they should accept U.S. students who are future C.I.A. officers and who will use their local expertise for covert activities and espionage at some later date?"[67]

---

[64] Lyman H. Legters, "International Studies: Fresh Support or Kiss of Death?" *International Studies* 24, no. 5 (September 1992): 50.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Lyman H. Legters, "International Studies: Fresh Support or Kiss of Death?" *International Studies* 24, no. 5 (September 1992): 50–51.

[67] David MacMichael, "Spooks on Campus," *The Nation,* June 8, 1992, 780.

This concern is one aspect of a wider debate about the direction of education in the United States. The model case is perhaps the field of Middle East studies. As explained by the author of one article on the debate, scholarly advances in Middle East studies in the United States were "accompanied by a growing gap between academics studying the Middle East and the officials, agencies, and institutions of the U.S. government, and a corresponding decline in the influence of university-based scholars on the shaping of foreign policy and on the media."[68] Among other things, many scholars in the field were unhappy with U.S. policy toward the regime of Saddam Hussein during the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, the 1991 Gulf War, the 2003 invasion of Iraq, and Israeli occupation and settlement of the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem, and rejection of a Palestinian state. This was accompanied by a more critical view of scholarly acceptance of government funding for research than had prevailed during the Cold War and, in particular the Vietnam War, in part because of concerns about how the results of government-funded research would be used.[69] "The real issue was which part of the U.S. government was supplying the funding, for what ends, and with what conditions," with particular concern over requests for research on issues of interest to the military or the intelligence community.[70]

On the other hand, the right is concerned that the academic community has withheld needed support from government decision makers because of political disagreement with Administration policy.[71] Moreover, critics of the academy assert that because of unacceptable political bias, Middle East scholars have consistently failed to

---

[68] Zachary Lockman, "Critique from the Right: The Neo-conservative Assault on Middle East Studies," *CR: the New Centennial Review* 5, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 75.

[69] For a concrete example of how the academic community is concerned that its work could be misused, see Wayne Nelles, "American Public Diplomacy as Pseudo-Education: A Problematic National Security and Counter-Terrorism Instrument," *International Politics* 2004, no. 41: 65–93. Nelles, a Canadian scholar, reviews the conduct of U.S. public diplomacy in Central America during the Cold War (specifically in Nicaragua and Panama during the Reagan Administration), the 1999 Kosovo conflict, and the Global War on Terror (specifically in the Muslim world), and concludes that these efforts are essentially propagandistic, "indoctrinational," and hegemonistic rather than examples of "authentic and mutual learning."

[70] Ibid*.,* 75–80.

[71] See, for example, (a) Lockman, "Critique from the Right," 76–79; (b) Jennifer Jacobson, "The Clash Over Middle East Studies," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 6, 2004, A8, quoting testimony of Stanley Kurtz before the U.S. House Subcommittee on Select Education.

provide accurate explanations and assessments of events in the Middle East, while "pushing a radical political and theoretical agenda" and achieving "intellectual and institutional hegemony in U.S. Middle East studies." They have used their positions to "purvey extreme and one-sided criticisms of American foreign policy,"[72] disseminate anti-American views of postcolonial thought, and discourage students from working for the government.[73] The government needs to "reform the process it use[s] to decide which Title VI-funded national resource centers received funding, by including government officials in the review process and encouraging more attention to public outreach activities."[74]

The critics of the academic community are probably overstating the community's refusal to assist the government. In 2004, a survey of Department of Education data noted: "Contrary to the charges, Title VI has a long and continuing history of partnerships with the U.S. government, and of educating students who go on to work for government at all levels and across agencies."[75] On the other hand, there is some truth to the complaint. For example, while the U.S. Army has begun attaching anthropologists to military units in order to obtain a level of cultural awareness that will enhance operational success in the Muslim world,[76] the practice is controversial within the discipline.[77]

---

[72] Elizabeth Crawford, "Area-Studies Programs Come Under Fire," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 4, 2003, A19, quoting testimony of Stanley Kurtz before the U.S. House Subcommittee on Select Education.

[73] Miriam A. Kazanjian, "Renewal of HEA–Title VI: a Mixed Picture," *International Educator* 13, no. 1 (Winter 2004): 44.

[74] Lockman, "Critique from the Right," 96–99.

[75] Kazanjian, "Renewal of HEA–Title VI."

[76] See, for example, (a) David Rohde, "Army Enlists Anthropology in War Zones," *New York Times,* October 5, 2007, national edition; and (b) Montgomery McFate, "The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture," *Joint Forces Quarterly,* no. 38 (2005), 42–48.

[77] See, for example, (a) Executive Board, American Anthropological Association, "Statement on the Human Terrain System Project" (October 20, 2007), American Anthropological Association, http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-HTS.cfm; and (b) Montgomery McFate, "Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious Relationship," *Military Review* 85, no. 2 (March–April 2005), 24, 28.

Like Middle East studies, global education is controversial in the United States for some of the same reasons: "In the 1990s, the global education movement in the United States took on a number of ethnocentric characteristics. Largely because of attacks from the political Right, global educators worked hard to avoid issues that were controversial. In addition, they often strove for what was euphemistically called 'balance.' That is, 'teach about other peoples and countries, but do it "patriotically."'"[78] The movement is not confined to the U.S., however, and the global educational programs of other countries might suggest some of the features of a national strategy for the United States.[79]

D.   SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

Several themes appear in the literature: (1) The national interest requires a body of citizens who are familiar with foreign languages and comfortable working in (or with people originating in) foreign cultures. (2) For much of the 20th century, the federal government supported educational programs in foreign languages, area studies, and related fields. (3) Notwithstanding these federal programs, the nation suffers significant shortages of people with the requisite skills to assure the performance of critical functions such as public diplomacy, intelligence, law enforcement, or even commerce. (4) There are several reasons for the failure of existing federal programs, notably including lack of adequate funding and lack of overarching management and strategy for achieving a set of agreed goals.

While the literature, thus summarized, leads to the conclusion that the nation could benefit from the development of a national strategy for global education, very little has been written about what the content of such a strategy should be. As noted above, the lack of an overarching strategy appears to have led to the adoption of *ad hoc,* piecemeal expedients that have encountered funding problems and some political controversy. The object of this study is to identify and organize some fundamental principles upon which a

---

[78] Kenneth A. Tye, "Global Education as a Worldwide Movement," *Phi Delta Kappan* 85, no. 2 (October 2003), 165.

[79] Ibid and works cited therein.

national strategy for global education can be based. While this study will not produce such a strategy, I anticipate that it can serve as the first step in the eventual development of a strategy.

The anticipated audience for the results of this study will be those who are responsible for the national effort to produce a citizenry that possesses the skills necessary to ensure homeland defense and security. This may include education policymakers in the homeland defense and security community (e.g., the Department of Homeland Security's Directorate of Science & Technology, the Department of Defense), the intelligence community, the federal law enforcement community, the Department of State, and the Department of Education. It may also be of interest to education professionals at all levels, state and local law enforcement, and the business community.

E.   METHOD

1.   Research Method

The principal method for carrying out this study was semi-structured interviews, supplemented by review of documents. The universe of respondents consisted of a convenience sample drawn from the relevant organizational elements of federal and nonfederal agencies, universities, and the private sector. Twelve interviews were conducted, based on the outline contained in the Appendix. The respondents were offered anonymity; all spoke to the writer with the understanding that the views they expressed were their own, and not necessarily representative of the organizations that employed them. However, all of the respondents held positions of considerable seniority and responsibility; together with their often distinguished career paths, their positions offer some assurance that their perspectives were informed by experience. It was hoped that the use of interviews from multiple sources in government, the academy, and the private sector would help ensure a diversity of views and provide a degree of reliability to interview results through triangulation of data sources.[80]

---

[80] Deborah K. Padgett, *Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research: Challenges and Rewards* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998), 96–98.

In most cases, interviews were recorded and transcribed, and the transcripts later reviewed and coded thematically. In three cases recordings could not be made, and the writer has relied on contemporaneous notes of the conversations.

The respondents included the following individuals: an official familiar with international educational programs of the U.S. Department of Education; an official familiar with language services supporting a federal law enforcement agency; an official familiar with language programs supporting the Intelligence Community; an official familiar with language programs supporting the Department of Defense; two Foreign Service Officers (U.S. Department of State) who formerly held positions as Diplomats in Residence at U.S. universities; a Foreign Commercial Service Officer (U.S. Department of Commerce) who is familiar both with U.S. commercial operations abroad and with the Service's career development and assignment programs; a cultural anthropologist familiar with the Human Terrain program of the Department of Defense; a senior executive of a major urban police department; a professor of psychology from a major U.S. university well known for its focus on foreign affairs; a professor of international relations from a Seven Sisters college; and a senior executive of a major multinational consulting, accounting, and management firm. Together, these respondents had experience derived from the defense, diplomatic, and intelligence communities, federal and state law enforcement, the academic world, and the private sector.

2.   Limitations of the Study

There are obvious limitations to this research method. No matter how senior the respondents or how great their authority, knowledge, and experience, a sample of 12 cannot claim to be representative of the various constituencies from which the respondents were drawn. It is therefore impossible to use the results of these interviews, even when supported by the literature, to draw conclusive generalizations about the issues raised by this study. Indeed, several of the respondents alluded to differences of opinion within their own professional communities about the questions at issue, and the respondents' answers to the interview questions were certainly not in complete agreement.

On the other hand, even where the respondents disagreed, they expressed concerns that appeared consistently through the interviews and about which there was substantial agreement. This was true even when one might have thought that the respondents' interests were competing, rather than complementary. On some matters, there was complete agreement, despite the multiple perspectives that the respondents brought to the issues. This suggests that, particularly where the respondents' views mirror those of the published literature—that is, where the views of senior practitioners accord with those of researchers and other interested parties—there is a degree of validity greater than what is suggested by statistical considerations of sample size, representativeness, etc.

It became apparent during the course of the interviews that a number of the respondents were professionally acquainted, and several asked directly whether I had spoken to others. This may be considered a potential impairment of the confidentiality of the interviews, and may be supposed to have inhibited some of the respondents in providing fully candid answers to questions. Since many of the respondents held official positions in agencies of federal and nonfederal government, it may also be supposed that their responses mirrored the official positions of their agencies. It appeared to the interviewer, however, that most respondents gave their personal views with great candor, even when those views may not have coincided with those of their employers.

This was qualitative, not quantitative research, and it had the limited objective of providing a preliminary answer to the question whether and how a national strategy might enhance existing programs that are intended to improve the nation's security and prosperity. The results suggest that it might, by providing a unified national vision of the approach to solving a national problem, raising public awareness, and harnessing the combined efforts of the government, the academy, and the private sector toward achieving the desired ends. The results of the study also suggest that further research into the specifics of developing and implementing such a strategy would be fruitful.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II.   WHAT'S THE PROBLEM?

A pervasive lack of knowledge about foreign cultures and foreign languages in this country threatens the security of the United States as well as its ability to compete in the global marketplace and produce an informed citizenry. The U.S. education system places little value on speaking languages other than English and on understanding cultures other than one's own. . . . [S]tudents in the United States tend to understand less about the beliefs, cultures, and history of other nations than their foreign counterparts.

At the same time, the need for language and area expertise is compelling. The federal government has experienced the lack of foreign language experts with appropriate cultural competence for some time. . . . But foreign language professionals are needed not only in federal bureaucracies. People with language skills and area expertise are needed to ensure the nation's ability to compete economically. Increasing foreign competition and declining market shares for U.S. products highlight the need for globally competent business representatives. . . . For U.S. business to penetrate foreign markets, they need an understanding of foreign cultures and economies and how to best interact with possible customers and trading partners.

— Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, National Research Council of the National Academies (2007).[81]

The National Research Council thus captured in 2007 the essence of the argument made in much of the literature: there are not enough people with the skills needed to provide the nation with security (both internal and external), prosperity, and firm diplomatic alliances, and one of the principal reasons is the failure of the education system to provide what is needed.

The Council qualified this strong language, however, by noting that it had not "conducted a systematic assessment of the extent to which shortages exist," and for that reason did not use the term "'shortage,' referring instead to 'demand' or 'unmet need.'" Rather, it acknowledged that "the significant demand for people with foreign language,

---

[81] National Research Council, *International Education and Foreign Languages,* 15–16.

area, and international skills for government service, academia, K-12 education, and business *suggests* that there is a significant unmet need."[82]   In consequence, the first questions this study sought to answer were: (a) From the perspective of senior professionals in the area of education, security, commerce, and diplomacy, have existing programs indeed failed to meet the nation's needs? (b) If so, why?

A.   IS THERE A PROBLEM?

Perhaps surprisingly, in view of the National Research Council's findings, there was widespread agreement but not unanimity among the respondents interviewed for the present study about whether existing programs have failed to produce enough individuals with the language skills and cultural knowledge to meet the nation's needs. There was less agreement about the gravity of the problem. The differences among the respondents reflect the broad outlines of the discussion on a national scale; indeed, in stating their views, some respondents seemed to anticipate and address concerns that would be raised by others. This summary may therefore be useful to policy- and decision makers in considering what remedial measures, if any, would be necessary or particularly desirable.

1.   Do We Know Whether There Is a Problem?

The great majority of respondents (75%) said that there was a shortage of people with the skills needed to conduct the nation's business. Two respondents (17%) said there were insufficient data to answer the question. One (8%) said there was not a shortage of qualified individuals, but that government agencies had insufficient resources to hire the number of people needed to carry out their missions.

The respondent who said there was no shortage of people with language and cultural skills was speaking specifically about the needs of the Foreign Service. This respondent, a career diplomat familiar with State Department recruiting programs, spoke in generally favorable terms about both the talent pool in the general population and the efforts of educational institutions nationwide to improve their programs. Speaking of the

---

[82] National Research Council, *International Education and Foreign Languages* 113 and n. 1 (emphasis added).

applicant pool, the respondent said, "[T]here's a recognition we aren't hiring enough people. But that's different than saying there aren't enough of the right people out there for us to hire. [T]here's a tremendous amount of talent all over the United States. And people come into the Foreign Service in orientation classes, and every orientation class shows the diversity of our candidates: where they come from in the United States, what their personal background is, what their experience is, what languages they speak, and so on." It should be noted, however, that the Foreign Service provides its own, widely respected language training to its officers within the cultural context of the area of assignment. Further, using a process validated by an organizational psychologist, it screens applicants for "cultural adaptability"[83] in the course of its oral assessment. It does not rely on the nation's education system to produce candidates with language training and cultural skills

Those who said that the question could not fairly be answered asserted that data are lacking in two areas: the nation's needs and its resources. First, there are insufficient data to describe the nation's needs. Several respondents noted this problem, particularly within the Intelligence Community. Virtually all of the respondents had some idea of ways in which areas of need could be projected, and several offered rather specific thoughts on principles for developing staffing models. But those who addressed the issue generally felt either that the staffing models currently in use were too narrow in scope to be of use in determining national needs (in the absence of an effort to assemble the projections from multiple agencies), or were ineffective for some reason—most frequently because the agencies had insufficient funds or authority to hire in the numbers suggested by the models. In addition, there appears to be no mechanism on the national level to capture the needs of state, local, and tribal governments, or the private sector.

---

[83] The State Department defines cultural adaptability as the ability "[t]o work and communicate effectively and harmoniously with persons of other cultures, value systems, political beliefs, and economic circumstances; to recognize and respect differences in new and different cultural environments." Richard E. Kramer, Director, Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, letter to Candidates for Foreign Service, October 4, 2008, U.S. Department of State, http://careers.state.gov/docs/3.0_Oral_Assessment.pdf (accessed November 5, 2008); Bureau of Human Resources, U.S. Department of State, "Guide to the Foreign Service Officer Selection Process," U.S. Department of State, 29, http://careers.state.gov/uploads/c3/aa/c3aaf51ecdde77b983c7d763bc7d20b0/3-0_FSO_RegGuide.pdf, (accessed October 27, 2011).

Second, there are no reliable data to describe what the available talent pool is, or what the education system or agency training programs are currently producing. Certainly there are some data about the results of federal educational grant programs, but as one respondent reported, "student data tracking is very difficult and sketchy." Similarly, while the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and the Defense Language Institute (DLI) may have good information about their production of graduates with language and cultural skills, one respondent stated that there are very few organized foreign language programs anywhere in the federal law enforcement community, and minimal organization on the state and local level. Consequently, little information is available about the results, if any, of programs supporting law enforcement. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is reportedly well supported,[84] but relies heavily on native or "heritage" speakers.[85] Thus, its language services do not depend on U.S. foreign-language education or training.

Even those who said that the question couldn't be answered without more data concede that more resources should be devoted to the development of language skills and cultural education and training. A respondent familiar with Department of Education programs said, bluntly, "It's nice that we have what we have, but do we need a lot more? Yes!" Likewise, a respondent familiar with Intelligence Community programs said, "We do not have in sufficient quantity or capability the right skill sets to meet the challenges that we face today."

The remaining respondents agreed that there was a need to provide the American population with better education in foreign-language skills and knowledge of other cultures. Their reasons for thinking so are closely entwined with their views on the gravity of the problem, discussed below.

---

[84] *But see* the October 2009 report of FBI's Office of Inspector General, cited in footnotes 39–42, above, and accompanying text.

[85] Heritage speakers are generally understood to be individuals whose preferred language is English but who learned another language through exposure at an early age, typically from parents or grandparents.

2.   How Serious Is the Problem?

Among respondents who felt that there was a lack of individuals with the language and cultural skills needed to conduct the nation's affairs, assessments of the gravity of the problem tended to break down along occupational lines. Respondents from the law enforcement community generally felt that the needs of their own and similar agencies were not critically underserved, although supporting services could be improved. Respondents from the diplomatic, intelligence, and defense communities felt that they had critical needs that were not being met, with consequences that were sometimes serious. Respondents from the academic world and the commercial sector felt that these skills were essential to American success in a variety of endeavors, and that the U.S. education system is not producing graduates who possessed these skills. A number of respondents said, however, that U.S. schools at all levels are beginning to pay more attention to the problem, albeit inconsistently and in various places around the country.

The law enforcement community recognizes the need for language and cultural skills. One respondent familiar with federal law enforcement told of having to interpret conversations in languages as varied as Dari, Hindi, Pashto, and Soninke. "I mean, gone are the days when it was just Russian and Spanish." Another respondent, from an urban police department, spoke of having to interview crime victims and witnesses in Korean, Spanish, or Mandarin Chinese. Both spoke in almost identical terms of the value of observing cultural norms (e.g., removing one's shoes before entering the home of an Iraqi immigrant) for establishing respectful relations with a potential complainant or witness from a culture that might inculcate a mistrust of law enforcement.

Neither respondent, however, felt that language training nor cultural skills were critical priorities for their agents or officers. Although such skills were viewed as desirable assets, their agencies had supporting resources that alleviated the need. The FBI has language analysts and interpreters to support its agents; it can often hire agents who speak the languages most needed to do criminal investigations in the Unite States. ("[Y]ou can't do a counterterrorism investigation in Miami without speaking Spanish"); and it can provide basic, "survival-level" training for agents who need to work abroad.

27

While FBI agents who become legal attachés at U.S. embassies receive some training at FSI, however, they are not required to speak a foreign language.

Likewise, the urban police department makes an effort to recruit officers who reflect the ethnic balance of the city's population: "it would be optimal for us if we could work on that level." It has units tasked to reach out to culturally or linguistically distinct communities (e.g., immigrant communities, the gay and lesbian community, the deaf and hard-of-hearing community), staffed by officers with the skills necessary to communicate effectively with those constituencies. For individuals or communities whose languages are not represented by these liaison units, the department has the ability to put an officer in touch with a contract interpreter. That ability *is* critical: "[I]f . . . an officer's responding to the scene of a crime, and . . . can't immediately understand what the person's saying, obviously, time is crucial in fighting crime. If we can't get this information dispatched and on the lookout, then it really hinders our ability to close that case." For agencies with liaison units and access to contracted language services, however, a program to train more officers to speak more languages is a luxury rather than a critical need, and one the agency may not be able to afford in light of other demands on its resources. In this respondent's city, at least, that is true not only of the police department but of other city and state agencies as well.

Not all state or local agencies have access to such services. A respondent familiar with state and local law enforcement issues said that suburban and rural law enforcement agencies have had "huge challenges" in dealing with immigrant populations, particularly in recent years when there has been an increased demand on local agencies to assist federal authorities with the enforcement of immigration laws. If "their officers . . . don't represent the community that they're serving," or the communities themselves are largely homogeneous, departments outside the very largest metropolitan areas may not have the skills needed to work effectively with immigrant populations or the funds to have contractors available to assist on short notice. For such departments, a recruiting pool better educated in foreign languages and cultures could be a significant enhancement. As one respondent pointed out, it is sometimes difficult for state and local agencies to predict a need for surge capability in specific skill sets: "Oftentimes it's like a disaster. You

28

realize this after the event has already taken place, when you don't have the people; when the plane crashes and they're all speaking Spanish and you don't have any bilingual speakers."

This recognition is reflected in the professional "literature." In a film produced by the U.S. Department of Justice for training local law enforcement officers, a local police official in the National Capital Region observes:

> You know, we're often asked, "What relevance does cultural competency have to do with law enforcement?" And the reality of that is, that misconceptions can lead to a lot of circumstances that are law enforcement oriented. That it sounds non-traditional, it sounds like it's not a law enforcement issue. But look around us, and you have language issues that could lead to officer safety problems; you have visual issues where people look different; you have worship issues where we have a multitude of houses of worship of different kinds in this country and county now. And we all live together remarkably well, but we know remarkably little about each other. The more we know about each other the safer we're going to be around each other, the more we're going to appreciate ourselves, the similarities and the differences, and understand that we're mostly the same.[86]

For the diplomatic, intelligence, and defense communities, language and cultural skills are critical to the successful performance of their missions. In the world of diplomacy, the importance of these skills is almost self-evident: the function depends on the ability both to express effectively the views of one's principal and to understand and interpret clearly and correctly the views expressed by the counter-party. As one Foreign Service Officer said, "[O]ne of the major tools in our toolbox would be language acquisition and language use, because you can't successfully work overseas, especially in public diplomacy, if you don't have a high degree of language." Cultural understanding is equally important:

> I think . . . people are coming around to a realization of the importance of cultural as well as linguistic fluency. . . . [I]t's actually essential, certainly. And it's essential partly because we do live in a dangerous world. . . .

---

[86] David Baker, Hate Crimes Coordinator, Community Relations Division, Montgomery County (MD) Police Department. *On Common Ground: Sikh American Cultural Awareness for Law Enforcement* (Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, 2007). Available online at http://www.justice.gov/crs/video/ocg-video.htm.

[R]emember that intervening period after 9/11, when a lot of governmental people were saying, "Why do they hate us?" . . . [T]here was severe lack of understanding, they didn't understand to what degree or why, they didn't understand the way many of our actions played around the world, they didn't understand the results of some of the things that we were saying and doing, how those things were perceived.

Perhaps equally self-evident are the value of language and cultural understanding to the Intelligence Community. One respondent familiar with both law enforcement and intelligence concerns said that, "in the Intelligence Community . . . there is a huge vacuum for people who speak foreign languages." This is a serious impediment to a mission that depends on the collection, analysis, and exploitation of data from foreign sources. Another respondent familiar with defense and intelligence concerns observed that the Intelligence Community is generally tasked to identify and help plan for the neutralization of targets, but gives very little attention to the civilian population. This leaves decision makers in the position of acting with significant gaps in their understanding of the potential consequences of their decisions.

Similar concerns underlie the Defense Department's Human Terrain System. As one respondent explained, it is impossible accurately to project and plan for the probable consequences of a military operation without a thorough understanding of the society in which it is to be conducted, particularly when the object of the operation is nation-building or reconstruction. Without knowledge of the cultural norms and social structure of an area, an understanding of the potential conflicts of various social identities, and ability to work effectively outside one's own culture, even operations undertaken with the most benign objectives can give rise to unintended and adverse consequences. As another respondent pointed out, examples include the unforeseen difficulties with the restoration of civil society in Iraq after the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, and the analogous, violent collapse of Yugoslavia into something resembling its previous constituent parts after the death of Josip Broz Tito.

Yet another respondent suggested that language and cultural skills are also critical in the effort to restore civil society when combat operations are over: "[W]e can win the war but we can lose the peace. . . . [T]he transition is probably where we don't do so well.

That's where we see the value of language and culture. Because, you know, during any type of combat phase, there's really not a whole lot of language and culture going on." The focus at that point, however, is not on the military planner, but on the soldiers who deal with the civilian population every day:

> [T]he military is very big on kinetic effects, and second, third, and fourth order impact of those kinetic effects. Well, if you think about soldiers on the ground, you've got thousands of kinetic points of contact for culture on a daily basis, that have much more powerful second and third and fourth order effects than a bomb at a wedding party. And we need to recognize that, and we need to help prepare all of the people that . . . are potentially going to have a kinetic point of cultural contact, of the ramifications of their actions. And even if it's a split-second delay in somebody, an 18-year-old kid who thinks, "Oh, maybe I shouldn't do that," or . . . , "No, I'm not going to keep my sunglasses down when I'm talking to you," or "No, I'm not going to spit on the ground in front of you," things like that, we can really affect a lot of behaviors just by focusing on basics.

Obviously, these are not things that can be handled *ad hoc* by contractors, analysts, or interpreters. They are skills that in the opinions of these respondents must be acquired by military professionals, from general officers to enlisted personnel.

Finally, one respondent said that "the needs are just erupting" throughout the whole country right now. Although best acquainted with the needs of the defense and intelligence communities, this respondent noted that even on the state level, demands are increasing in many areas such as judicial systems, which need not only interpreters and translators, but also people proficient in foreign law and culture.

Concerns in the academic community seem to center on two broad areas: availability and quality of instruction, and quality of research. Availability and quality of instruction are concerns that go to the essence of the nation's problem, because without instruction there can be no skilled practitioners. There was general agreement among the respondents that the availability of effective, practical education in language acquisition and cultural skills is spotty. One Foreign Service Officer said:

> [A]s you're talking about what schools are teaching or what's lacking in the States, we're very diverse, it's very uneven around the country, and the

31

quality of education is uneven around the country. . . . But there are pockets of people who are, schools and individuals, who are really making an effort at promoting the kind of approach in education that you're talking about. . . . [I]t's only happening at a small number of places; it's a growing number of places, schools around the country that are thinking about these kinds of issues. But it's really, really, really uneven.

A respondent familiar with Intelligence Community needs said, "At the government level it's very hard to develop the [recruiting] pipeline because your pipeline is essentially the public education system. And until and unless there is some type of nationwide effort or nationwide acceptance that foreign language needs to begin in the public school systems, then I don't think we're ever really going to solve the long-term supply issues."

Describing the problem with traditional language education in the U.S., a university professor said:

> [Y]ou end up with language departments who are like, the Spanish departments around the United States, most of them are concerned with educating students to speak Castilian really well. French departments are deeply concerned with giving people a classical understanding of France. Those are the two top departments, by the way, Spanish and French. If you go down the list, the next largest nowadays is Chinese, and many of them don't even teach the Chinese script that's actually used in China. Because that's how everybody who's teaching in those departments was educated and it's what's still being used in Taiwan. . . . [S]tudents will five years later come back and say "I've been working in Paraguay or in Bolivia for five years, and I finally now can communicate, and occasionally I can read people Don Quixote, and translate it to them into contemporary Spanish, and they find it really wonderful because Don Quixote is truly wonderful. But what I learned at [college] was to speak like a 16th Century Castilian."

Two professors said that part of the problem with language acquisition education was resistance to curriculum modification from senior faculty who, in language departments were more concerned with teaching the high culture of a society and the literature produced in its language, and in other disciplines were generally disinclined to impose (or make accommodation for) language requirements, particularly in graduate

education.[87] A respondent familiar with international education programs expressed the view, however, that this problem is diminishing. This respondent agreed that the problem described by the academics existed, but also said that junior faculty were more receptive to language acquisition and that, in essence, the Old Guard is retiring. Interestingly, one of the professors directly contested this view, saying that junior faculty are concerned about publishing, and generally will not want to spend time developing language skills if not required to do so. In that respondent's view, the widespread re-establishment of language requirements in the universities and the adoption of language acquisition instruction will require the support of university presidents.

Quality of research is a concern about the extent to which the disciplines look beyond narrowly American concerns. One professor said:

> [A]lmost of all of the work that is done in American psychology is done on Americans. So that people draw universal generalizations about people from the United States. Economics departments are overwhelmingly, and especially in the last 40 years they've become even more so, concerned about, well, they're not even concerned about macroeconomics, but . . . if they ever become concerned about society as a whole, they're concerned about the United States of America. Political Science departments and the discipline of Political Science, it's half in the United States about American politics. Sociology is about problems of American cities, basically. The disciplines dominate undergraduate education, and the disciplines are incredibly parochial.

Another respondent observed that the U.S. suffers from a severe lack of basic research about much of the world, including some places of strategic interest. Before the invasion of Iraq, for example, there was only one person in the U.S. who had done research in Iraq during the rule of Saddam Hussein, and insufficient basic sociocultural data to permit well informed planning.

Finally, in the commercial world, there is increasing recognition that reliance on English to conduct business really is not good enough. As one respondent said, "English is the universal language of business, but it can produce some really strange, suboptimal

---

[87] Apparently this problem is not unique to the United States. *See* Jonathan S. Swift, "Foreign Language Ability and International Marketing," *European Journal of Marketing* 25, no. 12 (1991), 36, 45.

results." These results may arise when "there [is] a lack of understanding, and that [is] fostered and the relationship [is] hampered by one party of the relationship forcing the other party to speak their language and not finding common ground." Respondents from the private sector, the Foreign Service, and the Foreign Commercial Service emphasized the importance of establishing a working relationship through personal contacts, and the difficulty of achieving that end if language or behavioral norms become obstacles. An American who goes to a meeting in France and plunges into business without observing the custom of introductions around the table and some preliminary conversation about, say, art, politics, or literature, has failed to establish that he or she is a person of intelligence and substance who deserves to be taken seriously. In the commercial world, even a very elaborate contract may not embody all of the expectations of the parties if those are informed by the legal and commercial environments in which the parties customarily operate. Consequently, background knowledge about the relevant business culture and the ability to communicate effectively in a trade partner's language are increasingly valuable assets in an increasingly globalized economy.

A question that almost all respondents found difficult to answer directly concerned the point at which it becomes commercially beneficial to learn a foreign language or culture. There was general agreement that language and cultural skills have become indispensable for the largest companies, and for any concern engaged in significant international trade. On the other hand, for example, can an Iowa hog farmer justify, in economic terms, the cost of learning another language? Respondents answered this question at different levels of abstraction.

On the most concrete and specific level, one respondent from the Intelligence Community suggested that as economic globalization progresses and business is done globally on a more regular basis and internet-based trade increases, we may reach the point where even very small business may find it advantageous to purchase supplies or inventory abroad. In such cases, profit can be increased by eliminating middlemen, including factors and translators. A Foreign Service Officer pointed out that there are international organizations for farmers (such as the International Federation of Agricultural Producers), and that direct farmer-to-farmer communications may help

address issues such as concerns over the production of genetically modified organisms—which are considered unsafe products in parts of Europe but widely used in U.S. agriculture—with greater credibility than pronouncements from governments.

Somewhat more abstractly, a Foreign Service Officer suggested that the answer depends on an individual's vision—whether a farmer or other businessperson is interested in growth, or simply maintaining the economic status quo. This respondent also offered the view that younger people, now entering the job market, have the kind of vision that embraces participation in international trade or professional organizations in which information is exchanged, in light of an increasingly global marketplace. Another Foreign Service Officer and a Foreign Commercial Service Officer expressed the view that foreign language study enhances one's ability to communicate even in one's own language, "[b]ecause they've had the experience of trying to understand somebody and trying to express themselves in a situation where they had to overcome an obstacle to even know what each other was saying." This, in turn, gives rise to the acquisition of useful transactional skills, including cultural awareness.

On the other hand, one respondent warned that acquisition of language skills is *not* the first priority for an enterprise that wants to engage in international trade:

> [I]f we assume that this company wants to do business either exporting or expand internationally, it's probably less important to have the language skills first than it is to have the mission and the resources and the drive and the commitment to expand beyond your home market. If you decide, "Yes, my product will work in 70 countries and I'm going to set aside and bankroll that effort," then yes, the way you do that effectively is to get language-trained people. But if you would, to do it the other way around, "Well, I'll get a bunch of people speaking various languages," no. . . . You can always buy those skills. You can always find a translator. But you have to have the commitment to do something abroad. And then once you have the commitment and the resources, then one of the first things you would do is, for your designated markets, get someone who has the language skills, but also the necessary cultural skills.

On the most general level, several respondents suggested that beginning language and cultural education in elementary school would benefit the nation as a whole, because incorporating this course of instruction in the education system generally will produce a

much larger pool of candidates from whom government, commerce, and the academy can then recruit, and for which these employers will incur greatly reduced expenses for language and cultural education and training. Indeed, several respondents noted that effective language training by itself is a time-consuming and expensive proposition, which many employers—governmental and otherwise—can ill afford. Spreading the cost throughout society by beginning education at the earliest practical level would, in the end, benefit the entire society. As one respondent said, "I think what you tend to see is a limited amount of dollars going to a limited amount of programs to give them exactly what they need, because there is no broader recruiting pool. What we really want to have is a much broader pool to recruit from."

B. WHY IS THERE A PROBLEM?

The literature reviewed in Chapter I, above, suggested three broad reasons why existing educational programs had failed to produce a pool of graduates with skills adequate to meet the nation's needs: lack of an overarching strategic vision, inadequate federal funding for language and cultural education, and political controversy over the design and content of educational programs. None of the respondents spontaneously identified lack of a strategic vision or plan as a problem; when asked, 75% said that some form of national strategy could improve the situation.[88] Many of the respondents cited lack of funding, but the issues extended beyond education into staffing and compensation models. Political controversy, though featuring prominently in the literature, did not seem to be a serious concern for most of the respondents; rather, gaining sufficient political influence to acquire the necessary resources and leadership was a larger concern.

Beside these broad areas, however, almost all of the respondents were able to identify other impediments to success in meeting workforce needs. Some of these were

---

[88] The National Research Council's assessment of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs administered by the Department of Education commented on the absence of a master plan or unifying strategic vision. As a remedy, it recommended the appointment of an executive-level officer, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to oversee the Department's programs, provide strategic direction, and "consult and coordinate with other federal agencies." It also recommended that Congress require the Secretary of Education, in collaboration with ODNI, DoD, and the State Department, to submit a public report every two years outlining national needs in language, area, and international studies, plans for addressing those needs, and progress made. *International Education and Foreign Languages,* 4, 242–46.

most concerned with government agencies, some with educational institutions, some with the private sector; a few were of general concern. Not all of these issues were connected with the success or failure of federally funded education programs. They are discussed below, however, for ready reference.

1. Government Issues

Areas of particular concern to government respondents were impediments to hiring qualified personnel, the lack of incentives for the workforce to maintain skills not in immediate demand, and the failure to project needs accurately and comprehensively on a government-wide (or national) basis. Multiple respondents identified obstacles to employment of skilled applicants. In particular, the process of obtaining security clearances was mentioned as a problem. It is time-consuming, which itself presents an obstacle to job-seekers who may opt to seek other employment while awaiting clearance; and for some native or heritage speakers, it may be impossible to obtain the highest security clearances (SCI)—or to obtain them within the required time frame. This was a matter of particular concern to two respondents familiar with issues in the defense and intelligence communities, because although SCI clearance is required to work with the relevant agencies, it may not be required for access to the material with which the employees will actually be working and is thus an unnecessary impediment. In fact, the "vast majority" of the work done by the National Virtual Translation Center, created by the USA PATRIOT Act to support the Intelligence Community, is unclassified. Other structural impediments to hiring skilled applicants include those familiar to any government agency, notably the length of the recruiting and hiring process, competition with the private sector, and hiring limits.

In the area of providing incentives for the acquisition or maintenance of language skills, state and local governments may have an advantage over the federal government. A senior leader of a major urban police department said that the department provides a stipend to officers who pass a test showing proficiency in a foreign language. Departments in other jurisdictions reportedly pay stipends to officers with advanced degrees, which could provide an incentive for advanced language, cultural, or area

studies. This does not appear to be true in federal law enforcement: according to another respondent, foreign-language pay incentive programs exist in the Intelligence Community, but proposed authority for the FBI is limited to employees with approved languages (consistent with the National Intelligence Priority Framework) who are actually working on national security matters. In consequence, speakers of Spanish and other languages that are common but important to the FBI would not qualify for an incentive; nor would speakers of Arabic, Chinese, or other critical languages if they were employed in law enforcement activities, rather than counterintelligence or counterterrorism. While these distinctions may be based on fiscal realities, they may have significant, unintended results: for example, harming employee morale by rewarding one group of employees based on where they are assigned, rather than on their skill sets, or impairing the FBI's ability to maintain a large pool of employees with valuable skills who can be transferred, say, from criminal investigation to counterterrorism as the need arises, and returned when the need abates.

Another respondent recounted a similar problem in the Foreign Commercial Service: the compensation of officers with a certain level of language proficiency is augmented while they are posted to a country where that language is spoken. Once the officer leaves the post; however, the extra compensation stops. In consequence, only highly motivated individuals do the work needed to maintain skills in languages they do not need immediately. Some thought has reportedly been given to Service-wide stipends for officers who maintain their language capabilities; the argument against it has been that the agency cannot afford it. The contrary argument, as the respondent pointed out, is that the amount of money involved is relatively small, and that, in the modern world, "you can't afford not to."

Several respondents observed that part of the reason for the nation's apparent failure to produce individuals with the language and cultural skills required to meet its needs is that those needs have never been determined. This view was stressed by the respondents who were reluctant to express a view on the question whether there has been a significant failure, as well as others. One respondent put it vividly:

You know, people will constantly say, "We need more, we need more people who speak Arabic." That's a very broad statement. And most of the people who say we need more people who speak Arabic don't understand that Syrian is not the same as Egyptian is not the same as Levantine is not the same as Iraqi and on, and on, and on. They just say we need more. Well, what are we trying to build to? Give me a number. Throw something on the wall that says when we can declare victory or, you know, yes, I've made it, or tell me I'm even 10% on the way to where I need to be. . . . That is always, always, always going to be a moving target . . . . But . . . what we should be able to do is, we should be able to come up with a methodology where we can look at our historic trends, to determine what the core component of that is that we can program toward, to meet.

At the same time, however, as investment advisors like to say, past performance is not a guarantee of future results: "within each agency there's got to be an amount of adaptability or flexibility as priorities change."

Not only that, different agencies will have different priorities. As another respondent observed, "we could probably do a lot of load-smoothing in terms of the priority stuff for the government, but beyond that there is stuff at each individual agency's level that needs to be done that may not be a priority for the whole but it's a priority for that organization." Further, although for homeland security purposes the needs of state and local agencies will to some extent overlap with those of the federal government, state and local agencies (and federal response agencies such as FEMA and HHS) will for the most part be focused more on meeting the language needs of their domestic constituencies. Changes in foreign affairs may have effects on immigration patterns, for example, that can alter the needs of local agencies even when those effects are so small as to be insignificant on a national scale: "[Y]ou know, we could have a change . . . , and we've got a bunch of Georgians coming in all of a sudden and how do we deal with that Georgian population, without any Georgian speakers? And population shifts happen pretty quickly at times, depending on what's happening in the world situation."[89]

---

[89] The National Research Council also concluded that "there is currently no systematic, ongoing process for assessing national needs for foreign language, area, and international expertise and developing approaches to address those needs." Ibid.*,* 4, 244–46.

2. Education Issues

Areas of particular concern in the arena of education—that is, in the production of skilled job applicants—were program availability, program quality, and funding. Interestingly, some respondents argued that many students are not pursuing language or cultural education because they are unaware that these skills could be a significant asset in many career paths; others said that students and their parents were clamoring for language and cultural education, but these needs are largely unmet at all levels of the education system for a variety of reasons.

One respondent observed that both teachers and students through the high school level are largely unaware of career opportunities available to those with language and cultural skills. Students thus feel no incentive to remain in language programs. To provide a better informed view, agencies such as the FBI and the Intelligence Community have been supportive of initiatives to inform teachers at professional gatherings (such as meetings of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) and to provide early and engaging study opportunities for students outside the school year (such as the STARTALK program, which funds summer programs for language teachers and students from kindergarten through high school). As one respondent said, "[M]ost students think that the only reason they have to do that is to become a language teacher. So the teachers like to show their students, well, if you study Spanish, you could become an FBI agent or you could become a DEA agent, or you could go to become a diplomat or something." The Defense Department sponsors the Language Flagship programs, which are intended, among other things, to begin language education in the U.S. in primary school, rather than in high school where it has customarily begun.[90] Other respondents reported that the State Department works with colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations, reaching out both to institutions that are developing "an educational environment in international affairs late in the game," and to students whose backgrounds might not have led them to

---

[90] The Language Flagship, "K–12 Programs," National Security Education Program, Department of Defense,
http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=48&Itemid=84 (accessed November 15, 2011).

consider a career in public service or foreign affairs. DHS and the FBI recently partnered to pilot National Security Internships for university students.

On the other hand, several respondents suggested that there is a substantial, growing, and unsatisfied demand for language and cultural education at all levels. Potential employers (e.g., the State Department, an urban law enforcement agency, the Intelligence Community) observe that an increasing number of applicants come to the job with some language skills already, and that there seems to be a growing demand for instruction. The problem is, as one respondent said, that there may not be teachers available at all levels to teach the languages in demand. Some schools have had to waive their normal requirements in order to hire language teachers at, say, the K-6 level, and the cost of establishing instructional programs nationwide is potentially quite high.

Another respondent reported that universities generally are not meeting the demand, either. Scholars of international relations have recognized this at least since 2002.[91] One reason may be a pervasive lack of focus on foreign affairs. One respondent observed:

> If you ask parents and students, what they didn't get that they thought they were supposed to get when they were in college was a broad understanding of the world and globalization, and an ability to understand and work in other cultures. And it's like, it is way ahead of every other thing that is considered negative about American education, and it applies to every level of American education from community colleges to Yale and Harvard.

Other reasons, such as the quality of language education and the availability of cross-cultural education generally have been discussed previously (see Section II.A.2, above). While the aims of federal programs intended to alter this state of affairs (such as STARTALK, the Language Flagship, and other programs of the National Security Language Initiative) are admirable, the programs are painfully small: the Language Flagship, established in late 2000 to provide "a small cohort of students" with an

---

[91] Jean Krasno, "US Colleges and Universities are Not Meeting Student Demands," *International Relations Curriculum Challenges* (New Haven: Academic Council on the United Nations System, 2002). This paper is a summary of the findings of a seminar entitled "Taking Stock of How We Teach International Relations," held November 22–23, 2002, at the Yale Center for the Study of Globalization.

opportunity for intensive postgraduate language study, [92] had a total of 8,890 students enrolled in 2009 in language programs at all levels from kindergarten through the master's degree.[93]   To put this in context, the Census Bureau estimates that there were approximately 75,190,000 students in the United States in 2009 at all levels from pre-kindergarten through college (the bachelor's degree).[94]   As one respondent said, "the programs like Fulbright, that seem to work well, really don't affect large numbers of people and they tend to affect people who are . . . already on a trajectory to become interested in other cultures."

Several respondents mentioned inadequate funding for education in these skills. One respondent asserted bluntly that the nation's investment is simply insufficient as a percentage of gross national product, and added that when funds for public education are short, "language is the first to go along with the drums and the music lessons and the art studios in our high schools and elementary schools."   This problem is reflected in the literature, and little more need be said.   Funding shortages affect not only institutions' ability to hire and retained qualified instructors in the numbers necessary to reach a substantially larger student base, but also students' ability to pursue effective courses of study that might include internships or foreign travel.   Of course, the inability to produce students eventually also guarantees a shortage of instructors.

3.   Private-Sector Issues

Turning to the private sector, two respondents directly questioned whether the business community has clearly communicated its need for skilled applicants to students, parents, and educators, or even whether it is sincere in claiming it seeks applicants with

---

[92] The Language Flagship, "The Language Flagship: Changing the Paradigm of Language Education in the U.S," April 2008, National Security Education Program, Department of Defense, 1–2, http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/The_Language_Flagship_Report_August_2008.pdf (accessed November 15, 2011).

[93] The Language Flagship, "The Language Flagship: Changing the Way Americans Learn Languages," July 2011, National Security Education Program, Department of Defense, 3–7, http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/2010_Flagship_Annual_Report.pdf (accessed November 15, 2011).

[94] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012* (Washington, DC: Gov't Printing Office, 2011), Table 219, http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0219.pdf (accessed November 15, 2011).

language and cultural skills. A professor of psychology said that students are extremely sensitive to signals about where their advantage may lie, and will respond very promptly to incentives. If, as some respondents suggested, students or their parents are not seeking education in these skills because they do not see their acquisition as a path to an interesting or profitable career, this may be because the incentive does not exist (i.e., is not actually reflected in private-sector hiring practices) or has been very poorly communicated.

This concern is at least anecdotally substantiated by the reported experience of other academics. A recent article in an academic periodical recounted the experience of one university administrator:

> Cheryl Matherly was going through résumés with a hiring manager for a major consulting firm when she had her "aha" moment.
>
> Like many employers, the campus recruiter put a premium on the ability of potential hires to succeed in unfamiliar situations with co-workers from different backgrounds and cultures. Ms. Matherly, then assistant dean of students for career and international education at Rice University, thought she had the perfect candidate, a history major who had won a scholarship to conduct three months of solo research in Spain. The value of his having navigated working alone in a foreign country, she thought, was obvious.
>
> But the recruiter pushed the résumé aside, dismissing the student's experience as a "backpacking trip through Europe," Ms. Matherly recalls. "That's what it boiled down to for him."
>
> "It spoke volumes to me about how employers commonly view an overseas-study experience," she says.
>
> The discrepancy isn't unusual. Even in an increasingly global economy, few companies set out to hire recent graduates who have studied or interned abroad. More than one survey of employers ranks international study low among cocurricular activities in its relevance to the workplace.[95]

---

[95] Karin Fischer, "Study Abroad's New Focus Is Job Skills: colleges strive to translate students' experience for employers," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 57, no. 9 (October 22, 2010): A1. Available on line at http://chronicle.com/article/Study-Abroad-Gets-an-Image/124979/ (accessed November 14, 2011).

Another respondent said that "the business community needs to put its money where its mouth is:" are businesses genuinely hiring students with intercultural skills, or are they simply looking for exceptional students, among whom one is more likely to find students who have pursued those studies? This respondent suggests that the question cannot be answered without data on who has been hired and how they have been utilized. The same respondent also observed that there are fewer jobs involving international contacts or travel than there are applicants interested in such jobs, which may lessen the attraction of qualifying studies.

A respondent from the private sector agreed to some extent. "[W]hat people may not be fully appreciating is how much, in many businesses today, especially large to medium size companies; there is a significant component of global business. And being able to deal globally and reach global clients. . . . I'm not sure the word is getting back, if you will, in the educational system. I'm just not sure that that's being highlighted in education programs, necessarily, at the undergrad level." On the other hand, this respondent felt that even in the business community, not everyone in the smaller and mid-market companies is thoroughly convinced of the need for language and cultural skills. A respondent from a university thought that "almost all of the companies that are relatively competitive right now are real clear about this and communicate it very well, not just to people who go to small, liberal-arts colleges . . . , but to people who are going to state colleges and universities and throughout the United States." Another respondent thought the situation was improving with a generational shift: as it becomes more common to hold a series of jobs in a relatively short period, and as the ideas of foreign travel and increasing globalization become more familiar, younger members of the workforce are more attracted by the prospect of living and working overseas. In addition, this respondent sees much more active recruiting for people willing to work overseas. In this view, the acquisition of language and cultural skills becomes more attractive to younger people.

4.   Cross-Cutting Issues

Some issues cut across all sectors. These include the acquisition of technical qualifications as well as language skills, cost-benefit analysis, and, fundamentally, sociocultural resistance to the notion that the acquisition of foreign language and cultural knowledge is beneficial.

Regardless of what work one does, one must acquire the specialized knowledge and vocabulary of one's occupation. Without broad-based and comprehensive language training, it becomes very difficult to find people who are able to address the substance of a complex or technical issue in multiple languages. As one respondent said, "[W]hen you say, 'Well, okay, I need somebody who really understands nuclear physics and speaks Korean,' well, is it easier for me to take somebody who speaks Korean and teach them nuclear physics? Or take someone who's already learned nuclear physics and teach them Korean? I don't know." One response to this problem is an argument made by some that the U.S. is a land of immigrants: with so many new arrivals every year, widespread language and cultural training is unnecessary because we have plenty of people who can provide what we need. Unfortunately, we cannot guarantee that the new arrivals will have the technical knowledge or vocabulary we seek, the requisite English-language skills, or even the ability to teach others their own language effectively.

A variation on this theme is the argument that because the U.S. is historically a country of immigrants, it has a population that is diverse in every sense. It is therefore already a multicultural society in which people get cultural sensitivity training in their daily interactions. Formal training in other cultures or cultural skills is unnecessary because the process takes place informally. Consequently, this argument concludes, formal education in cultural skills is a waste of scarce resources. Although interesting because it is based on the diversity of the American population, the argument is unpersuasive for two reasons, one having to do with the distribution of immigrant populations, the other with the effectiveness of proximity as a teaching tool. First, in 35 states, less than 10% of the population is foreign-born; in 19 of those states, less than 5% of the population is foreign-born. Only seven states have foreign-born populations

greater than 15% of the total population: in descending order (by percentage), they are California, New York, New Jersey, Nevada, Florida, Hawaii, and Texas. About 24.14% of the foreign-born population of the U.S. lives in the 25 largest U.S. cities.[96] While Americans may be exposed to many American subcultures, exposure to foreign cultures appears to be heavily concentrated in a few areas. The chance that most Americans will have significant contact with foreign cultures seems pretty small.

Yet another argument is that the United States does not need to emphasize language education because English is the language of science and commerce, and its importance is increasing, not decreasing. One respondent asserted that it was a mistake to believe, "Well, you know, we've got the dominant language, and people will just sort of come along with us." This respondent pointed out the diplomatic risks of miscommunication (as, for example, when President Carter's 1977 use of the word "desires" to allude aspirations of the Polish people was translated as a reference to their carnal impulses), and rejected the notion that the best scientific work is presently being published only in English. Even if the claim were true, however, the use of English is not necessarily advantageous in all circumstances. As already noted, one respondent acknowledged that English may be a common language of commerce, but it is by no means universal and its compelled use can lead to undesirable results.

A variant of this argument arises from the phenomenon of "language death"—that is, the loss of distinct languages through disuse in daily life and the death of native speakers.[97] It is sometimes suggested that the dominance of English and the rapid death of other languages renders it unprofitable to learn other languages. One respondent acknowledged the problem of language death, but tied it to the poverty of the societies in which the dying languages are spoken: "[T]he problem is that the languages that are dying off the most are languages of people who are poor. So that Finns are able to preserve Finnish because they happen to be rich, and they have a system whereby . . .

---

[96] Data are reported as of 2009–2010. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012* (Washington, DC: Gov't Printing Office, 2011), Tables 39–40, http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0039.pdf and http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0040.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011).

[97] See generally Jack Hitt, "Say No More," *New York Times Magazine,* February 29, 2004.

even though everybody reads other languages, they also translate everything that comes into the country into Finnish. . . . And Twi, and Ashante, that's not going to happen. . . . [A]ctually, in countries that are becoming richer, like India, the multiplicity of languages are now becoming stronger, and English is becoming weaker." In other words, the countries with whom we are most likely to want to have strong commercial and diplomatic relations are the countries most likely to resist the encroachment of English

One problem that featured prominently in the literature was the unwillingness of universities and their students to accept federal funding with a service obligation, or that was administered by or otherwise tied to the intelligence or defense establishments. Two reasons were typically given for this resistance: either the use of federal funding to dictate university course offerings was viewed as a violation of academic freedom, or it was feared that students abroad would be put in danger of physical harm by an exaggeration of their association with intelligence agencies such as the CIA. The respondents who addressed this problem said that it may once have been a significant issue, but that time has passed.

One respondent who makes site visits to university campuses says that students are very interested in language and cultural studies, and would welcome the chance to go to work for the Intelligence Community, or national or homeland security agencies. Other respondents agreed. "If you don't have to wear a uniform and pick up a gun, it's probably OK . . . . I think, given what's happened over the recent years, no: the idea of being able to contribute in a way that might prevent some of the problems, be they terror, be they wars, would probably be universally embraced. . . . It's being able to foster, if you will, international understanding, and how do you do it? Well, language study puts you considerably down that path." Another respondent, who had been a Diplomat in Residence, added that a number of students asked for advice about working for the CIA, as opposed to the Foreign Service or other opportunities in international affairs. "The impression I have after talking to them is that they were as shaken as anybody else by 9/11 . . . and in its own way it marked them . . . . [T]hey tend to be service-oriented. And in a lot of universities and high schools nowadays, there's a service component to their educations. So they're being educated with the idea of giving something back, of

contributing to your society . . . ." And on a purely pragmatic level, one respondent noted that the National Security Education Program has no shortage of applicants, and has become more competitive as the program has matured. This certainly suggests that there is no strong resistance among college and university students to some service requirement in exchange for federal funding for language and cultural education.

Several respondents suggested that there is some residual uneasiness among university faculties. One respondent with ties to intelligence and law enforcement reported having been asked not to return to the convention of one academic group (although the respondent noted that this took place before 9/11). A professor of international relations reported that many colleges and universities refused for a long time even to create an infrastructure of people who were familiar with programs tied to intelligence, defense, or security, "because they were opposed to the idea of encouraging students to work for the horrible U.S. government." This respondent noted, however, that students pursued these opportunities when the Administration articulated a positive vision of the U.S. in the world. Many more students were willing to think about public service in the Intelligence Community, the Defense Department, the Foreign Service and the Peace Corps during the Reagan and first Bush Administrations than in the years since, because of President Reagan's ability to articulate a positive and enduring world view, while the Clinton and second Bush Administrations fostered cynicism among students.

Perhaps the fundamental problem that gives rise to all the obstacles described above is the reluctance of American society to accept the need or value of adapting to the linguistic or cultural needs or desires of others. One respondent said:

> I think part of it is, the U.S. is not a society where being, for example, bilingual and bicultural is considered a really big asset. Part of that is because we're a really big country and speaking English is enough to get by. But it's also that part of what integration into U.S. society is all about has been a matter of losing one's previous culture and choosing to lose the culture of ancestors or something of that sort, and not picking up a culture of some other place. Being American somehow is to be an English speaker and to be somebody who knows what baseball scores are, who Yogi Berra is, and that sort of thing.

Another respondent, who is an anthropologist by training, agreed. Americans, said this respondent, do not do well at dealing with people of other cultures because we expect others to adapt to us. The linguistic counterparts, identified by a third respondent, are the "people who have thought that English was enough. And those are the people that you see overseas who just speak more loudly when they have an English sentence." Several respondents noted that relatively few Americans have traveled abroad; the State Department estimates that less than one third of the population holds passports.[98] The result, as one respondent said, is that "we're just, I think, stuck in this . . . American-centric posture sometimes that really doesn't help us."

---

[98] As of 2011, there were 102,183,989 valid U.S. passports in circulation. Bureau of Consular Affairs, "Passport Statistics," U.S. Department of State, http://www.travel.state.gov/passport/ppi/stats/stats_890.html (accessed October 10, 2011). As of October 10, 2011, the estimated population of the United States was 312,396,150. U.S. Census Bureau, "U.S. & World Population Clocks," http://www.census.gov/main/www/popclock.html (accessed October 10, 2011).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. WOULD A NATIONAL STRATEGY HELP?

As we have seen, most respondents agreed that the nation's education system has failed to produce an adequate number of Americans with the language and cultural skills necessary to conduct the nation's business. They also agreed that the problem is significant, and that there are a variety of reasons for the problem. The respondents were therefore asked whether the development and implementation of a national strategy for global education would help alleviate any of the impediments and thus contribute to a solution to the problem.

For most respondents, the answer was "Yes." One respondent did not express a view, two were uncertain, and one thought a national strategy would be undesirable. All of the respondents felt, however, that matters could be improved with strong national leadership publicly stating the need for better education in this area and discussing the benefits that improved education would bring. Even the respondent who opposed a national strategy felt that strong leadership could inspire Americans to bring about change for the national good. The respondents firmly expressed the view that the necessary preconditions for improvement are (a) the education of all Americans about the need for improvement and (b) the ability to demonstrate a resulting, bottom-line gain. Most felt that a national strategy, supported by the President and carried out under the leadership of a widely respected public figure, would be a good vehicle for achieving the desired ends.

Almost all of the respondents—including those who opposed the adoption of a national strategy or doubted its value—spoke of the need to raise public awareness. A respondent familiar with the Intelligence Community who questioned the need for a national strategy said: "What would be nice is to have nationwide recognition and acceptance that we have to be global citizens, we have to be part of the greater global community. And it's not a matter of, 'Teach everybody to speak English,' it's a matter

of, 'We should learn to be conversant in other languages, we should be able to adapt to other cultures and languages.'" Likewise, a Foreign Service Officer who opposed the adoption of a national strategy said:

> I think it takes political leadership, but I think it's possible to do that with regard to the way we . . . define American culture and . . . our national interest, and the way we view people who are different than us. And I think that's really important. . . . I would say it's a matter of our future security, and the health of the nation that more people realize that we are a diverse country, that we are unavoidably interconnected with places that are different than we are, that not everybody's our friend, and you don't necessarily convert them into being our friend by understanding them better. But you don't, you can't, on the other hand, effectively maintain our strength without having some understanding of who we're dealing with out there.

Many of the respondents who favored the adoption of a national strategy viewed it in part as a plan or a tool for bringing the necessary leadership to bear on the problem of raising public awareness.

By the same token, all of the respondents believed that improvement would be possible only if there was widespread understanding that it would produce tangible benefits. The nature of the requisite benefits varied: some respondents believed that the public would respond only to increased employment opportunities or other direct, economic gains. Others focused on improving the nation's ability to protect its security interests, whether on the international scene or at the municipal level.

In short, the arguments both for and against the adoption of a national strategy were based on largely pragmatic considerations. The arguments in favor reflected a judgment that there is an unfulfilled need that previous efforts have failed to satisfy; concern that the nation is failing to maintain its competitive position in both economic and security terms; and a desire to rationalize compensation and reduce competition for resources in the public sector. The arguments against reflected doubt about the value of centralized planning, uncertainty about the ability or willingness of diverse constituencies to agree on goals, doubt whether a national strategy was needed to bring about change, and questions about the allocation of resources.

52

A. VIEWS IN FAVOR OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY

On the macroeconomic level, a respondent from the private sector expressed the view that economic globalization is already underway, is probably irreversible, and is probably going to increase. "[W]e've got to promote the fact that this is the way it's going to be. And then . . . recognizing that, now, how do we get ahead of that?" In this view, a national strategy would be an important instrument for raising public awareness of the need for language and cultural skills to compete in the global marketplace; this in turn would help lay the foundation for a national discussion of goals and how to achieve them. An official familiar with Defense Department language programs agreed on the importance of raising public awareness: this respondent said that earlier efforts to enact legislation establishing a national language council had failed, and that the success of a language or global knowledge security initiative would require the national recognition that could be provided by a well regarded political "celebrity," such as former Secretary of State and Treasury Secretary James Baker, former U.S. Representative and 9/11 Commission Vice-Chair Lee Hamilton, or former U.S. Representative and current Director of Central Intelligence Leon Panetta.

A Foreign Commercial Service Officer also mentioned the key role of public support, suggesting that a national strategy could help educate the public in much the same way the "missile gap" and the effort to reach the Moon galvanized an earlier generation: "Sputnik, I think, set off a fuse, so we all benefited from the Space Race. But today I think people would turn around and say, 'You think that's more important than arithmetic and vocational ed. and driver training?' We're at the point where it would . . . be regarded by many people as a luxury and not the ABCs." In this respondent's view, the approach government should take is that it's not "doing the job of business, but doing those jobs that nobody else either wants to do or can do." The government can provide incentives for language and cultural education in part by providing some jobs and in part by helping support the educational programs that will feed commerce and help meet the practical needs of homeland security. "So it's not,

'We're training for something that we never hope to use,' like the bomb-shelter business, but rather whoever, the cop walking the beat, the analyst listening on the phones, there's going to be a need for these skills."

It is perhaps worth noting in this connection that the renewed interest in education occasioned by the Space Race did not benefit military technology alone. Much of what was developed as a result was profitably applied in the civilian sector. It is easy to see how similar benefits could flow from language and cultural studies. As this respondent said, "[T]he expectations and the . . . various warfighting efforts we have going on, would show that perhaps we didn't have all the cultural understanding that . . . would have served us well at an earlier point." Literature published over the past ten years suggests that the private sector might well say the same about product development, marketing, and enterprise management.

These concerns will only increase in an increasingly globalized economy. At least one serious textbook on marketing argues that, "In an increasingly interdependent world where barriers to trade and international exchange constantly diminish, cultural differences remain the single most enduring factor to influence marketing strategies."[99] This book argues that while "[l]anguage is an important aspect of culture," social institutions "are the 'spine' of the cultural process, linking the individual to the group. Institutions include the family, as well as political institutions, or any kind of social organization that encourages an individual to comply with rules in exchange for various rewards."[100] While language is important, it can only be properly understood in the context of the environment in which it is used, including behavioral expectations and

[99] Jean-Claude Usunier and Julie Anne Lee, *Marketing Across Cultures,* 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Education, 2009), 2. This work, first published in 1992, is now in its fifth edition.

[100] Ibid*.,* 5.

nonverbal communications.[101]   The literature is, of course, replete with examples of marketing and management gaffes resulting from an incomplete understanding of language in its cultural context.[102]

The competitive posture of purely commercial enterprises might not appear at first glance to invoke homeland security concerns; but it must be remembered that "approximately 85% of the Nation's critical infrastructure" is privately owned or operated,[103] and that sectors of critical infrastructure such as agriculture, finance, information technology, shipping, and telecommunications are owned almost exclusively by private industry. The National Infrastructure Protection Plan envisions a public-private partnership;[104] as discussed below, a strategy agreed by a "megacommunity" consisting of government, commercial, and nonprofit stakeholders may well be the appropriate model for a national strategy for global education.

A federal law enforcement official felt that language and cultural skills were too important *not* to need a concerted, national plan. This respondent said, "[T]he country's foreign language posture really determines whether or not we have diplomacy with countries, whether our economy works because of the globalization of all these companies. [E]ven though a lot of people do speak English, we can't just make that assumption. And beside that, if we really want to win over the hearts of everybody, we do have to make an effort to speak their languages. So I think there needs to be something" in the nature of a national strategy.

---

[101] Jean-Claude Usunier and Julie Anne Lee, *Marketing Across Cultures,* 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Education, 2009), 2. This work, first published in 1992, is now in its fifth edition*, 342–60.

[102] For example, "Pepsi's popular ad theme of the '60s, 'Come Alive With Pepsi,' was translated into German as 'Come out of the Grave with Pepsi.'" Similarly, the auto company slogan "Body by Fisher" was translated in "several European countries" as "Corpse by Fisher." 3M's English-language slogan for Scotch tape, "Sticks Like Crazy," was translated into Japanese as "Adheres Like Insanity." Andrew Paxman, "Selling in a Second Language: Literal Translations Can Sabotage Marketing Campaigns," *Business Mexico* 3, no. 6 (June 1993): 36. Numerous other examples are collected in a chapter on "Translation" in David A. Ricks, *Blunders in International Business,* 4th ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 80–99.

[103] Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (Washington: Executive Office of the President, October 2007), 4, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf (accessed October 18, 2011).

[104] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Infrastructure Protection Plan* (Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2009), 10, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/NIPP_Plan.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011).

A university professor expressed the view that effective instruction in language and cultural skills will require a change in the way instructors are educated; and that, in turn, will require a fresh view of teacher education "at the highest levels." This view is consistent with the opinion of another academic, noted in Chapter II, that language and cultural education in this country is often provided in a manner that fails to teach the skills needed to meet the demands of modern society, whether in the public or the private sector. The latter respondent went on to suggest that the value of a national strategy would be to identify a set of national goals articulated by the President and the Congress, as well as central policy direction and the use of coordinating mechanisms to harness existing agencies and their resources. This respondent did not believe that such a strategy should involve centralized planning or the imposition of specific requirements on specific institutions, but rather the development of a framework in which multiple institutions could set goals appropriate to their capacities and constituencies in support of an overarching national mission.

A Foreign Service Officer said that the development of a national strategy would foster a shared vision of a collaborative national effort. This would accomplish two important things. First, it would help create a national constituency for improvements in global education. Among other things, it could do this by embracing a message of equal opportunity: "I think . . . part of what it can do to sell itself is this universality of opportunity, the idea that in *our* country we need everybody, everybody's help to succeed in these efforts, nobody's excluded. Just because your last name isn't some well-known last name associated with international affairs, you can still . . . make your contribution, and everybody in our country has the right and the obligation to make these kinds of contributions to this national effort." Second, it would help move programming beyond each agency's "narrow-banded vision of what they're there to accomplish," which is determined by the agency's specific mission. While such a focus may be good for the

organization, it tends to undermine the kind of interagency collaboration on cross-cutting issues that GAO has found enables agencies "to deliver results more efficiently than when acting alone."[105]

Other respondents also noted the management advantages that could be realized through the adoption of a national strategy. A respondent familiar with federal law enforcement language programs observed that the Intelligence Community and federal law enforcement agencies have different authorities with respect to hiring and setting compensation for people with the language skills they need. This respondent expressed concern that differences in the ability to hire and compensate were, among other things, lowering interest among prospective language students in the languages of most interest to law enforcement, and giving intelligence agencies an unfair advantage in competing for skilled linguists. It was this official's belief that the development of a national strategy could reduce interagency competition by equalizing, or at least rationalizing, hiring and compensation. Significantly, like the academic mentioned above, this respondent did *not* favor a strategy that would establish unitary goals or priorities for the entire nation or even the government. As already noted, the concept of a national strategy that embraces and supports diverse goals and priorities set individually by multiple stakeholders is the model of the National Strategy for Homeland Security, with its National Infrastructure Protection Plan and the multiple sector-specific plans for various elements of critical infrastructure and key resources.

Another respondent believed that the implementation of a national strategy could help management evaluate job performance based in part on the language and cultural skills of members of multi-agency teams. A Foreign Service Officer pointed out that certain functions, such as diplomatic missions, are staffed by multiple agencies, including representatives of the diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement, defense, and homeland security communities. While these officers may be performing related jobs in pursuit of a common mission, they are not required to have the same language or cultural

---

[105] GAO, *Language Access,* 32. GAO defines collaboration broadly as "any joint activity that is intended to produce more public value than could be produced when organizations act alone." GAO, *Results-Oriented Government: Practices That Can Help Enhance and Sustain Collaboration among Federal Agencies,* No. GAO-06-15 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2006), 4.

competency skills, even when those qualifications are important to success on the job. For example, the legal attaché who lacks sophisticated language skills may be unable to join fully in a conversation with other embassy officers and their foreign counterparts; or, lacking adequate knowledge of prevailing customs, may fail to do what is necessary to be taken seriously.[106]

At least one respondent viewed a national strategy in very pragmatic terms as a tool for obtaining Congressional authorization and funding for a more robust national program. A respondent familiar with Department of Defense cultural research programs said that any initiative would need a strategic planning document that Congress could support and fund. Such a document should outline the advantages the United States would lose by not having programs in place to develop people with the needed skills, attempt to quantify how many people will be needed as opposed to the number now available, etc. It would thus serve the dual purpose of providing a plan upon which Congress could act and an explanation of the benefits that would follow, for the education of the public. Another respondent, who teaches international relations at the university level, agreed on the need to identify "a set of national goals that is articulated by the Congress and the President and that everybody has to somehow respond to." But this respondent also warned that such a document would need to walk a fine line between articulating a centralized vision guiding anything involving education and research that could affect the long-term interests of the United States, and "too much tinkering" with the autonomy of existing institutions.

B.   VIEWS OPPOSING A NATIONAL STRATEGY

As noted above, only one respondent directly opposed the adoption of a national strategy for global education. Two others, however, expressed significant doubts about the value of such a move, and for purposes of this discussion are counted as opponents.

---

[106] In 2009, GAO reported that even State Department officers in critical posts sometimes lacked the skills required to adjudicate visa applications properly, develop relationships and otherwise gain insight into current developments at their posts, or conduct public diplomacy. GAO, *Department of State* (2009), 14–16.

A Foreign Service Officer who directly opposed a national strategy did so on both policy and practical grounds. This respondent said that, as a political matter, "I think the big controversy is having a national policy on education, *punto basta.* That there isn't a school anywhere that really likes having national direction on . . . what they're supposed to teach." The respondent recognized, however, that this view might have been colored by personal opinion: "I guess I don't like the idea of a central management of anything. So that's my natural inclination." On the other hand, the same respondent raised a very practical concern about the ability of schools around the nation to deliver a consistently high-quality education in these areas. "I'm thinking, as you're talking about what schools are teaching or what's lacking in the states, we're very diverse, it's very uneven around the country, and the quality of education is uneven around the country. So getting a national strategy for anything related to education—good luck with that." This respondent felt strongly that instead of a national strategy, a national will to improve global education could be fostered by political leadership, in much the same way that the former First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, fostered a national awareness of conservation that led to the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 and some of the other environmental initiatives of the Great Society.

A senior executive of a major urban law enforcement agency had equally pragmatic concerns about the value of devoting manpower and other resources to training officers in language and cultural skills:

> Well, the question is, how much of a commitment would it be? And I'd need further clarification, you know, if I had access to this, would I be sending five officers to France to work with French intelligence and learn the French language? Obviously, I think it should be built in at an earlier level . . . and . . . at the end of the day, I get back to that question of what value is it going to add to my operations? If I lose, let's say if I, for even one of these intelligence exchange operations, if I send four officers to Morocco to work on an intelligence caper, I've gotta ask myself, "I'm losing four officers off the streets of [my city]. I've never had . . . an Osama bin Laden kill anybody [here]. I've got people dying here every day in homicides. What are they really going to bring back that I can't get from the federal government? What critical skill that's going to outweigh me losing four people?" So I think that's one of the bigger challenges.

> Obviously, I'd like to see more young people in America taught at an earlier age and have greater diversity, language diversity, but at our level, once again, I'd have to ask, "What's the value added?"

This respondent felt that to be practical, language training should begin at the earliest possible age, with cultural skills added at an appropriate point; but was troubled by the prospect of demands on the workforce, with no immediate benefits in return.

In an ideal world, this respondent would not be training police officers in language and cultural skills, but would be hiring from an applicant pool that was already trained. "[B]y the time folks are officers, there's so many competing demands for time. Even the homeland security curriculums I'm trying to push into the Academy, if we pushed in everything that we could, the Academy would be three years long instead of nine months. And then you've got the annual in-service training, and just the regular things, the firearms requals, the hazmat, Special Threat Action Team, civil disturbance training, all the things we're trying to [do]."

At the same time, this respondent recognized the need for officers to possess at least some working knowledge of the subcultures within the community. From a law enforcement perspective, this might have even greater importance than language skills: "I think it's very important that officers are very in tune to the different communities that live amongst us. Whether it's . . . [members of self-contained religious communities], whoever it might be, you've got to know about that culture. Knowing the language is definitely . . . a benefit, but once again something that's a priority based upon where you're currently assigned at the time." This view seems to be endorsed at least in part by the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security, which have produced short (less than one hour) training films on selected subcultures in the U.S. (e.g., Arab-Americans, Muslims, Sikhs) for the law enforcement and homeland security communities.[107]

---

[107] E.g., Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Introduction to Arab American and Muslim American Cultures for DHS Personnel,* DVD (Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2006); Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, *The First Three to Five Seconds,* DVD (Washington: Dept. of Justice, 2005), http://www.justice.gov/crs/training_video/3to5_300k/Intro.htm (accessed November 2, 2011); Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, *On Common Ground: Sikh American Cultural Awareness for Law Enforcement*, DVD (Washington: Dept. of Justice, 2007), http://www.justice.gov/crs/video/ocg-video.htm (accessed November 2, 2011).

An official familiar with the Intelligence Community's language programs agreed that language training needs to start well before an applicant enters the hiring pool, and that public support for language education is crucial: "[A]t the government level it's very hard to develop the pipeline because your pipeline is essentially the public education system. And until and unless there is some type of nationwide effort or nationwide acceptance that foreign language needs to begin in the public school systems, then I don't think we're ever really going to solve the long-term supply issues." This respondent, however, was doubtful about the nation's ability to achieve strategic goals for global education. "I'm not sure we could deliver a capability to achieve it. Yes, we need the goals. Yes, we need something to focus people on. But then how do you make it happen?" Like the respondent who directly opposed a national strategy, in part on the ground that inequalities among school systems would hinder the achievement of national goals, this respondent said:

> In some cases the answer, I think, just comes down to resources. And honestly, when it comes down to the public school system, it really is all about dollars. Could they do it within the program that they have? Answer: probably not. You know, some programs are better than others, some programs have the ability to do it better than others . . . [H]aving a national strategy that you could not implement at the state level would be counterproductive. So that's kind of why I say, yeah, it would be nice if we could get there, but I'm not sure we could, I'm not sure we could make it happen.

This official was asked about the suggestion of a respondent from the private sector that language skills could improve the competitiveness of the nation's workforce, and that a national strategy could include a component to help repatriate jobs that had been outsourced abroad. The official's concern was that such initiatives would be forestalled by fears of a political backlash. "[A]ny time you're going to get a politician to stand up and talk about outsourcing, you immediately walk right into the buzz-saw of, 'Why should I learn a foreign language or someone else's culture? If you don't give their jobs away then I don't need to worry about it.' . . . [And] if you're going to bring it back in, why does the American workforce need to learn the foreign language or learn the culture?" This respondent also expressed concern that there were few jobs in the current

economy that require language skills; a long time (15 to 20 years) is required to achieve the degree of competency needed for such positions; and a significant amount of work is required to maintain foreign-language skills once acquired. In light of those disincentives, this respondent does not see much public support for a national effort to improve global education. "[U]ntil we have really thought out what we want to get out of [a national strategy] and how we would implement it, I think it would be premature. I think if we had those answers, then we might be able to put together a meaningful national strategy."

C.   DISCUSSION

Both the respondents who favored the development and adoption of a national strategy for global education and those who opposed it raised legitimate concerns. The principal themes that were most often mentioned were concern about a centralized planning process; the concomitant imposition of goals or priorities on stakeholders; lack of resources, or other impediments to the achievement of strategic goals; and the lack of any widely shared understanding of what is to be gained.

I suggest that the last of these is the first question that ought to be addressed in any effort to improve language and cultural education in the United States. Not only was it a concern raised by respondents in all sectors (federal, state, educational, and commercial professionals), but it is, as several respondents pointed out, crucial to public and political acceptance of the necessary investment. It is also a concern recognized in the literature on the subject. Twenty years ago, Jonathan S. Swift, a British academic, interviewed U.K. marketing and sales executives doing business overseas.[108] Reasons given by his respondents for failing to acquire foreign-language skills included: "I'm too busy to learn a foreign language," "We've been doing business with Spain for five years, and I've had no problems so far," and "Our joint venture company has people who speak excellent English"—reasons which may well sound familiar to homeland security

---

[108] Jonathan S. Swift, *Foreign Language Ability and International Marketing,* European Journal of Marketing 25, no. 12 (1991), 36.

executives with too many demands on their limited time and resources! Summarizing the previous work of others, Swift listed six advantages of foreign language skills:

1. Shows an interest in the culture and customer's country and often smoothes the path of negotiation by facilitating social contacts;

2. Allows a relationship of trust to develop;

3. Improves the flow of communications both to and from the market;

4. Improves ability to understand the ethos and business practices of the market;

5. Improves ability to negotiate and adapt product and service offerings to meet the specific needs of the customer;

6. Gives a psychological advantage in selling.

Swift went on to discuss how each of these advantages plays out in practical terms.[109] These benefits clearly accrue to commercial enterprises doing business overseas or with people of diverse cultural or linguistic backgrounds. But with a few alterations (e.g., changing the focus from "market" to "environment of interest," etc.), they can as easily apply to people engaged in homeland security functions, including intelligence, border and transportation security, and law enforcement.

A respondent for the present study from the private sector, who is well acquainted with efforts of U.S. business to outsource some functions to foreign workers, suggested that one element of a national strategy should be to devote some of this country's analytic capacity (whether in the public or the private sector) to identifying those products or services in the global economy that the U.S. workforce is uniquely or particularly well equipped to supply. In this view, outsourcing is an inevitable feature of increasing globalization because it allows companies in one country to do with the workforce of another country something they can't do well (or cost-effectively) for themselves.

---

[109] Jonathan S. Swift, *Foreign Language Ability and International Marketing,* European Journal of Marketing 25, no. 12 (1991), 40–44.

"[I]nstead of trying to say, 'We've got to stop jobs being outsourced to other countries,' it's maybe saying, 'How do we shift the value proposition?'" Identifying a market niche for existing or even prospective U.S. goods and services would be welcomed by management *and* labor; and where the market leads, politicians are sure to follow. The key would be securing the cooperation of government and the private sector in identifying business opportunities in the global market, and demonstrating how the acquisition of language and cultural skills will increase earnings and employment in the domestic market.

The value to be gained from global education should not be unfairly exaggerated, however, and a national strategy should be developed with its objectives firmly in mind. As Swift pointed out:

> Foreign language capability is but one of many skills with which the modern executive must be equipped, and whilst extremely important, it should not be considered an instant remedy or panacea for any and all socio-cultural problems encountered when dealing with foreign markets. . . . It must be appreciated that language is a tool with which to complete a job; it is a great help when used properly, but if used incorrectly it can become an expensive waste of time and resources. . . . [A]ll business people operate within a cultural environment; it is the provision of language training which enables them to move from one environment into another. The point about language competence is, obviously, that it facilitates the establishment of market closeness, and enables the marketer to examine his market in far greater detail than would otherwise be possible. Linguistic ability could be considered as the oxygen supply a diver needs for undersea exploration; without this oxygen he must remain on the surface, unaware of the strangeness and complexity of life beneath the waves.[110]

"The strangeness and complexity" concealed beneath surface appearances are, of course, precisely what homeland security professionals also need to be able to discern.

If the question of value can be resolved, then the problem of resources may be at least partly solved. Increased earnings and corporate profits may be expected to lead to increased tax revenues, which in turn can be applied in part to improvements in education

---

[110] Jonathan S. Swift, *Foreign Language Ability and International Marketing,* European Journal of Marketing 25, no. 12 (1991), 44–45 (citations omitted).

and training. With appropriate leadership, it might also lead to increased business participation in, and support of, global education programs. If it is true, as more than one respondent suggested, that school districts around the country vary widely in terms of their ability to teach language and cultural skills effectively, the support of government, business, and the nonprofit sector might be able at least to reduce some of the greater inequalities. This is not to say that global education programs will be self-funding, or that a substantial investment will not be required. I do suggest, however, that if the benefits to be gained from such programs are fairly projected and clearly explained to the public and the private sector, they should be sufficiently attractive to justify the investment of resources to plan and execute the programs. As one respondent from the Intelligence Community pointed out:

> We need industry to be standing up and saying, "We need people with these skills. We need people who can deal in the global market, we need people who are global citizens, we need people who understand culture." Because that's where change will tend to happen. When industry stood up and said, "We need computer programmers," boom! There they are, they were all over the place, okay? When industry makes demands, number one, government listens, and number two, academia listens. Because the second biggest funder of the academic system is industry. You know, they're coming and they're pumping all kinds of money in because these are the skill sets that they need.

Greater investment in global education is necessary, but probably not sufficient—throwing money at a problem is rarely a comprehensive solution. Even with increased revenues, the problem of different communities' differing abilities to deliver global education effectively cannot be eliminated overnight, or possibly even in the short term. And, as noted briefly above, one respondent pointed out, "having a national strategy that you could not implement at the state level would be counterproductive." But, these inequalities, and similar obstacles to improving global education in the United States, are part of the reality that a national strategy would try to change. There are manifest inequalities in the ability of different communities to provide homeland security functions such as critical infrastructure protection and incident response; but these inequalities are part of the reason to develop and implement a national strategy. Rather than avoiding an ordered and systemic approach to the problem because not all providers

65

have the same capabilities, the philosophy underlying the National Strategy for Homeland Security, the National Infrastructure Protection Plan ("NIPP"), the National Response Framework ("NRF"), and the National Incident Management System ("NIMS") is to provide a standard of performance toward which each community or stakeholder group should strive, taking into account the available resources and the circumstances on the ground.

That philosophy, I suggest, is the answer to the concerns that a national strategy would mandate costly, unfunded, unattainable, or unhelpful goals or priorities, without regard to the interests or capacities of its participants and stakeholders. Unlike those national strategies which rely primarily or exclusively on federal resources that are subject to national command and control (e.g., the National Security Strategy, the National Intelligence Strategy, or the National Strategy for Counterterrorism), the National Strategy for Homeland Security and its related documents (NIPP and its sector-specific plans developed through consultation between Government Coordinating Councils and industry-staffed Sector Coordinating Councils, NRF, NIMS, etc.) provide a model for setting overarching goals and a strategic approach to a common problem for a highly diverse and widely dispersed group of stakeholders.

The concept of a "megacommunity," elaborated in 2008 by a multinational group of business consultants,[111] argues strongly that strategic planning and management problems associated with globalization are best addressed through a flexible alliance composed of government agencies, the business sector, and "civil society" (public interest nonprofit organizations and other nongovernmental organizations). Certainly, as demonstrated above, all three sectors have an interest in global education in the U.S., and can therefore potentially be engaged in a joint effort to improve the nation's capacities.[112] Their engagement requires, however, that all three sectors share a problem (if not necessarily the same interests), and a sense of where the impact of the problem is felt. The shared problem and the shared impact give rise to a perception of overlapping vital

---

[111] Mark Gerencser, Christopher Kelly, Fernando Napolitano, and Reginald Van Lee, *Megacommunities: How Leaders of Government, Business and Non-Profits Can Tackle Today's Global Challenges Together* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).

[112] Ibid*.*, 62–67.

interests.[113]   Further, there must be a shared sense of commitment to joint or mutual action. While such a sense may arise spontaneously, it is mostly likely to occur "when leaders of diverse organizations within the latent megacommunity consciously engage together." When this essential engagement occurs, the participants cease "to fight each other or to cede authority to some governmental or quasi-governmental body," thus (in this case) substantially disarming concerns about the degree of federal interference in the affairs of local education authorities, universities, or the business community.[114]

In order to maintain a cooperative working arrangement, the participants in a "megacommunity" should agree on "a set of protocols and organizing principles that bring a degree of order to the relationships among the organizations, before their differences harden into conflicting interest." Ideally, this arrangement will take the form of a nonhierarchical network, with a multiplicity of points of contact ("links") among the participating organizations (or "nodes") to facilitate information sharing, the introduction of new ideas, and the identification of opportunities for action.[115] Finally, the network is intended to adapt to changing circumstances. In the interest of optimizing results for the whole network (instead of seeking to maximize benefits for individual participants), members are expected to be aware of local cultural values, to be aware of the interests of other members (if not necessarily to advocate for those interests), to look for patterns of consequence to the members' common concerns or objectives, and to be prepared to reexamine and revise objectives and tactics in light of ongoing experience.[116]

I suggest that although the idea of a "megacommunity" was published several years after the issuance of the first National Strategy for Homeland Security and related documents, it accurately describes their underlying philosophy. For example, the NIPP and the NRF expressly envision the participation of government, business, and civil society in dealing with the common problems of infrastructure protection and incident

---

[113] Mark Gerencser, Christopher Kelly, Fernando Napolitano, and Reginald Van Lee, *Megacommunities: How Leaders of Government, Business and Non-Profits Can Tackle Today's Global Challenges Together* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 67–69.

[114] Ibid., 69–71.

[115] Ibid., 71–73.

[116] Ibid., 73–76, 82–104.

management in their communities and nationwide; the NIPP, the NRF and NIMS establish a set of protocols for ordering the relations among the actors which is nonhierarchical because of constitutional limitations on the power of the federal government, principles of federal-state comity, and private ownership of most of the infrastructure; network-like communications are established among the actors to facilitate information-sharing; and the network is expected to adapt to changing circumstances. Indeed, both the NIPP and the NRF embrace iterative processes for planning, preparation, and response in light of assessed needs (risk) and experience gained (situational awareness, after-action reporting, and evaluation).[117]

It could be argued that the nation's need for global education is not directly comparable to its need to protect critical infrastructure and key resources, or to respond to and manage incidents requiring emergency services.[118] In both cases, however, there are stakeholders in government, business, and "civil society." There are important differences in the needs, priorities, and capabilities of these various stakeholders and within stakeholder groups; different constituencies have competing, and sometimes conflicting, interests. The National Strategy for Homeland Security and its related documents establish the framework for a "megacommunity" dedicated to the cooperative effort to mitigate a problem common to these diverse and dispersed constituencies. There does not appear to be a reason why they cannot serve as a model for a national strategy for global education.

---

[117] See U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Response Framework* (Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2008), 27, 32, http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011); U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Infrastructure Protection Plan* (Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2009), 4, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/NIPP_Plan.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011).

[118] See the definition of "incident" in the *National Infrastructure Protection Plan,* 110.

IV.   HOW CAN WE DEVELOP A NATIONAL STRATEGY?

The question of how to develop a national strategy for global education has several dimensions. There is, first of all, the interesting chicken-and-egg problem of developing a broad base of support for global education: is it necessary to develop support for the concept before a strategy is developed, or is it better to develop a strategy that includes a plan for building political and public support, as an early and ongoing process? Next there is the question of who will participate in the development of the strategy; and one can expect that the answer to that question will affect how the goals of a national strategy will be determined.

Questions of funding and implementation are beyond the scope of this study; but they are not independent of the questions addressed here. To the contrary, it can be anticipated that funding for programs undertaken in pursuit of a national strategy will depend on a political and public consensus that such programs are necessary and useful; and this, in turn, will depend at least in part on showing that they will deliver a concrete and identifiable benefit to the nation and its citizens. The need to deliver identifiable benefits suggests an initial step in identifying the goals of a national strategy; and the identification of these benefits is a function that the institutions constituting a "megacommunity" are well suited to perform.

None of the respondents made direct reference to engaging a "megacommunity" as that process is described in the literature. However, several common themes emerged during the interviews that suggest the value of such an approach. These include, among others, recognition of a common problem that cuts across sectors of the community; diverse and sometimes conflicting needs of various stakeholders; concern over, or hostility toward, centralized planning that could slight the needs of some stakeholders to the advantage of others; the need for a long-term approach to the problem; and the need for strong leadership at all levels to identify stakeholder needs and the benefits to be gained from participating in a national effort to resolve the common problem.

Like the arguments for and against the adoption of a national strategy, the respondents' views on how a national strategy might be developed were based on practical considerations, and tended to fall into two broad themes: creating the conditions necessary to support the development of a national strategy, and the process by which a strategy could be developed effectively once the necessary conditions were in place.

A. PRECONDITIONS FOR DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

The respondents identified at least three critical steps that must be completed before the nation can develop and begin to implement a national strategy for global education. First, stakeholders and the general public must be better educated about the need for, and particularly the benefits of, improving global education in the United States. While some respondents believed that there was widespread support among policy elites (e.g., Members of Congress and the leadership of constituent Executive agencies), there are too many competing demands to allow the allocation of limited national resources without a strong political consensus. Second, individuals of bipartisan (or nonpartisan) national stature must be recruited for the task of leading the educational effort. Third, the educational effort must allay stakeholder and public concerns about—or hostility toward—the role of the federal government in developing and implementing the strategy.

1. Stakeholders and the General Public Must Still Be Educated About the Importance of Improved Global Education

Perhaps unsurprisingly, all of the respondents believed that the essential precondition for improving global education in the United States was to ensure that the various stakeholders knew how they would benefit, and that the benefits would outweigh the costs. This view was expressed repeatedly, and across all sectors. All of the respondents expressed belief in the value of global education, and believed that most public policymakers shared that belief. But they generally doubted that there was a broader public understanding of its importance; and absent that understanding, they felt there would be little political support for investment in improvement.

A respondent familiar with language programs supporting the Department of Defense spoke of the need to educate federal leadership: "[T]his whole situation is education. Educating people. My job for the past 15 years has been to educate various sectors of leadership in DoD and outside as to the importance, the value of having the capability to understand other people, to get out of the mirror image that we have so built that, if it isn't on the screen in American form, you lose them."

One Foreign Service Officer spoke of the need to educate the public about the security implications of global education:

> I would say it's a matter of our future security, and the health of the nation that more people realize that we are a diverse country, that we are unavoidably interconnected with places that are different than we are, that not everybody's our friend, and you don't necessarily convert them into being our friend by understanding them better. But you don't, you can't . . . effectively maintain our strength without have some understanding of who we're dealing with out there. . . . I would go along those themes. And then it's easy. . . . You repeat the theme over and over and over again.

An urban police executive tied this concern not only to the general public, but also to the challenges for police officials trying manage and allocate limited resources. For the general public, this respondent thought, the question was one of opportunity for themselves of their children: "People are going to do what they see is going to benefit them. . . . [I]t's opportunity. What do people believe? What's going to be real for them? . . . I think ultimately it comes down to what is going to be the value added. It's that cost-benefit analysis." For law enforcement professionals, the question was what benefit education could provide that would outweigh the operational cost:

> [T]he question is, how much of a commitment would it be? . . . I think, at the end of the day, I get back to that question of what value is it going to add to my operations? . . . What are they really going to bring back that I can't get from the federal government? What critical skill that's going to outweigh me losing [some] people?

At the federal level, some respondents felt that there was adequate Congressional support for global education, at least in principle. A Foreign Service Officer said, simply, "Congress? Super emphasis on languages and study of other cultures." A Foreign

Commercial Service Officer, however, suggested that more funding was needed to ensure an adequately trained workforce, and that obtaining funding would require demonstrating that benefits would flow not only to business interests, but to the wider population.

> [Y]ou simply can't go and ask for money just because you don't have enough. . . . So I think we have to do it in terms of the appropriators, and understand we have 100 offices scattered around the country, they know every Congressman and Congresswoman, they see the effect it has on the local manufacturers, so I think we have to start playing this network to feed the beast. . . . And there are many things that we could do. So if you were to say, "What could we do with an extra $100 million?" we could spin tales of trade promotion, market research, and on-line this. But I don't know, we've, I think there's a tendency to want to avoid corporate welfare, although I'm not sure what you'd call what we're doing today; but generally the idea is that if you're able to build a product and ship it, then you don't need government assistance . . . .

> Another Foreign Service Officer agreed. This respondent said:

> I think that the first thing that you're going to want to do is to figure out what to link it to that will make people on the appropriations committees in Congress responsive to what you want to do. Obviously you can link it to security. People are going to sit up and listen if you link it to overall American prosperity or economics, commercial stuff, I think again that gets the attention of Congress. If you link it to international cooperation, you know, actions that you can take to help encourage others to support American positions in international fora, because we're better able to communicate for our positions, I think that resonates also. So I think that's the kind of link that you have to make, because nothing is free, and nobody ever gets your good idea because it's a good idea.

Interestingly, an anthropologist familiar with Department of Defense programs stated the same position in negative terms. In this respondent's view, policymakers and legislators may be strongly motivated, if they see that the United States might *lose* competitive advantage if it *doesn't* pursue improvements in global education. That showing can be framed in a way that crosses partisan lines: for example, conservatives could accept the view that the ability to understand foreign cultures and languages is an important tool for maintaining America's leadership role in an increasingly globalized economy and political arena. By the same token, liberals might be sympathetic to an argument that America's fundamental values, including promoting democracy, are better

served by a more multilateral or consultative (i.e., less "imperialistic") approach to its dealings with other nations; and that American economic and political initiatives (including security measures) will be more readily accepted internationally if the United States communicates and acts in a manner calculated to appeal to others nations' cultural sensibilities.

A respondent from the business sector expressed a similar view. In this respondent's view, economic globalization is a process under way, the business sector needs to recognize that, and the crucial question for the U.S. economy is how to position itself to benefit from the process.

> And I guess what I'm also saying is that we've got to promote the fact that this is the way it's going to be. And then . . . recognizing that, now, how do we get ahead of that? And so there's maybe a national strategy that would say, let's kind of get on with it, advance this, which might help moving this forward. Because my basic premise is, it's going to happen, we're just walking through phases of it now. . . . [I]t's timing, and building the case, you still have to build the case, I'm not sure enough people recognize this, or believe in it.
>
> . . .
>
> [Y]ou build on this idea of the reciprocation: making the U.S. workforce most effective in a global economy. So that's maybe the basis. How does the U.S. workforce, the people out there, begin to excel in being effective in a global economy? And so that could be the ability to be able to work in multiple countries, the ability to also sort of, say, be able to support multiple countries, and that reciprocation. And so I would say my initial thought is around that, if that's what you're trying to achieve, is that it is a global economy, and what we want to do is be, as a country, or that workforce to be most effective.

A university professor agreed that need for improved global education is well understood at the upper levels of the U.S. business community—"the end that would include . . . the jobs the people who go to a Top 20 MBA program feel that they're trying to get into"—but this understanding is by no means universal.

> I think one of the big problems with the American commercial world . . . is there is a significant part of the American economy and of companies in the United States that haven't quite figured this out yet. That's also why

they're failing. . . . [T]hat was nonacademic of me to say, but—almost all of the companies that are relatively competitive right now are real clear about this and communicate it very well, . . . not just to people who go to small, liberal-arts colleges . . . or in the East Coast, but to people who are going to state colleges and universities, and throughout the United States.

When asked how organized labor might be convinced of the benefits of a national strategy for global education, particularly in light of its general opposition to increasing economic globalization, this respondent answered in terms quite similar to those employed by the respondent from the business sector. "[I]n some sense the right answer is that it's going to happen. And better to adjust and be part of the control systems of this, you know, part of whatever system of reaction or regulation is going on, than to be completely excluded and made even more powerless than you already are."

The need to educate stakeholders and the public about the importance and benefits of global education embraces not only federal and local policymaker managers and the business community, but even those professionally involved in language education. A respondent familiar with federal law enforcement recruiting programs noted that federal recruiters were often well received at meetings of educators' associations "because they want their students to stay in their language programs in high school, and most students think that the only reason they have to do that is to become a language teacher. So the teachers like to show their students, well, if you study Spanish, you could become an FBI agent or you could become a DEA agent, or you could go to become a diplomat or something. In high school the teachers don't, they really don't know about all the opportunities that there are with people with foreign languages."

In contrast, at the university level the problem has less to do with *why* language and cultural knowledge should be taught than *how* it should be taught. According to one university professor:

> [T]he problem is that, remember, because of the tenure system it's very, very difficult to change what faculty members are willing to do, right? And the disciplines define the rules by which, you know, in most schools, the way people get tenure has much more to do with their contribution to their discipline than to their, anything that they do in terms of what they teach or anything of that sort. So the university leadership, the presidents

74

and that sort of thing, are able to shift what kind of people get hired, in the sense of saying, "Okay, we're going to now not really hire people who are traditional language teachers or something of that sort, we're going to hire people who are trained in these fields of global education," they can kind of change things around at that end . . . , they have the power to do that responding to market pressure, but they're going to do that against a kind of rear-guard action of entrenched faculty members and disciplines that need to be brought along or else it's going to be made much more difficult.

This respondent believes that the necessary market demand already exists,[119] and so far remains unfulfilled. According to another academic, however, empowering university leaders to make the necessary changes will require leadership from without, such as an "education President" or strong support from the business sector.

A respondent familiar with Defense programs agreed. This respondent argued that U.S. investment in global education is simply insufficient as a percent of GNP. In the face of declining tax revenues, the resulting fiscal pressures, and mandates such as those in the No Child Left Behind Act,[120] public schools are treating language programs like other "optional" programs such as art and music classes, and terminating them— even though "the parents will tell you that they keep arguing to keep these things."

The continuing need for education of stakeholders and the general public about the benefits to be realized from improvements in global education suggests that there must be at least some education before a national strategy can be fully developed and implemented. However, a "megacommunity" does not necessarily require that a full-blown strategy be agreed before participants begin to take some action to meet their common goal. The National Strategy for Homeland Security, for example, is a constantly evolving structure, particularly as its related documents become more specific and concrete in the details of how its overarching goals are to be achieved (e.g., in the Sector-Specific Plans of the National Infrastructure Protection Plan or the Annexes of the National Response Framework). The National Strategy for Homeland Security is not a perfect model for a national strategy for global education, largely because the National

---

[119] *See* Chapter II.B.2 above, particularly footnote 91 and the accompanying text.

[120] No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Strategy for Homeland Security was adopted in the light of 9/11, when there was almost universal agreement about the need for improvements to homeland security measures. Nonetheless, it demonstrates that specific plans adapted to the needs and capabilities of specific agencies, entities, and communities can be developed with broad guidance—but *without* the need for centralized command or control—from the national level.

I conclude that what is needed is an initial engagement of at least some of the constituents of a "megacommunity," with the initial object of educating the public and other stakeholders, and recruiting additional constituents.

2. Prominent Public Figures Must Be Recruited to Inform Stakeholders and the Public About the Importance of Global Education

Even those who opposed the adoption of a national strategy believed in the need to increase public awareness. Further, almost all of the respondents felt that this effort would have to be led by someone who was well known to the public and, at the very least, seen to be close to the President. This is not to say that other individuals or organizations have no role to play in public education; but the respondents seemed to believe that the job of raising public awareness would have to be led by a prominent public figure.

One Foreign Service Officer, who opposed the adoption of a national strategy, said:

> I think that we can inspire people to change our culture, just like Lady Bird Johnson did a lot about, and public service announcements, we changed the culture in the United States about littering. . . . And that wasn't, it wasn't national laws, it wasn't a national strategy, we changed the culture. And I think that we can do that. I think it takes political leadership, but I think it's possible to do that with regard to the way we view people who are, with the way we define American culture and the way we, and our national interest, and the way we view people who are different than us. And I think that's really important.
>
> . . .
>
> Because again, for a lot of people, it's just encouraging them to do what they have figured out we ought to be able to do, or that there's a lack of

that we need; and for other people it'll, they'll relate to it because they live in a town in Iowa where they never had anyone who was different than them, and now they have people who go to church with them who come from an extremely different background, and so they relate to them on that level. And so now they realize, "Oh, yeah, you know, I didn't know anything about *x* before, but it'd be good if more of us knew about *x* because . . ."

Another Foreign Service Officer agreed:

I think it should start at the top. And it should be a Presidential-level initiative. . . . [W]e need an education President or maybe a Vice President who could champion it, or even a wife of President who is very smart, very talented, very articulate, but is able to be the sort of public face behind that kind of – I'd say almost Mrs. President would be the best possible person, because they're always looking for projects.

. . .

A lot depends on, I think, having the President's imprimatur and a lot depends on the strength of personality and intelligence and ability to articulate an idea. . . . I mean there are people that can bring that degree of gravity, and gravitas, to a subject and stir people in a way that even a Cabinet member is not going to say, I mean you're just not going to say "No". . . . There's this, "Look at how people are listening, look at what she said, look how true it is, and the President is supporting this."

Both of the university professors who responded held the same view. As noted above, one suggested the need for an "education President." The other said it would be helpful "to have somebody relatively close to [the President] who gets along well with Congress who is helping articulate a single vision" of what is needed. Individuals identified by various respondents as having the "star power" necessary both to capture public attention and to provide leadership for a national effort included the First Lady; former First Lady and incumbent Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton; former Secretary of State and Treasury Secretary James Baker; the late U.S. Senator Paul Simon; former U.S. Representative and 9/11 Commission Vice-Chair Lee Hamilton; and former U.S. Representative, former Director of the CIA, and incumbent Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta.

On the other hand, a respondent from the business sector suggested that members of the business community might best be educated by their peers:

[M]aybe it's the industry organizations . . . . That could be one vehicle. Because they're going to be seeing the need from larger corporations and bringing that back down to other, to say these are the trends that we are all going to have to aspire to, or this is going to happen to us, and making that awareness, getting that mid sector. Those businesses that still do worldwide sort of stuff but their markets are going to have to be more and more global, might be a piece of that. There's probably an effort from the government side, back, the whole area of commerce and economic development and the government, I think would probably have a role there. But . . . how do these ideas, how do you move that through somewhat rapidly? There's probably, it has to probably end up on somebody's political agenda.

While most the respondents identified figures who are well known for their roles in government, the concept of a "megacommunity" suggests that prominent figures from the business world and civil society should also be enlisted in the educational effort. While public figures such as those named by the respondents may be willing to act as advocates for global education, we cannot assume that adequate funding will be provided by government in the absence of a broad political consensus. It therefore seems prudent to look to the business sector and civil society for leadership; and this is entirely consistent with the view expressed by the respondent quoted immediately above.

Some of those engaged in charitable endeavors who are best known to Americans are those whose careers have spanned both commerce and civil society. The names of entertainers such as Paul Hewson ("Bono") and Oprah Winfrey, or entrepreneurs-turned-philanthropists such as Bill Gates and Warren Buffet, will no doubt come readily to mind as examples. As noted above,[121] a "megacommunity" is based on the voluntary engagement of all three sectors to address a shared problem, and such engagement is most likely to occur when "leaders of diverse organizations within the latent megacommunity" reach out to each other. I suggest that if prominent governmental figures reach out to their counterparts in the business sector and civil society for

_____

[121] *See* Chapter III.C, particularly the text accompanying footnotes 111–116.

assistance in a preliminary effort to educate the public and other stakeholders, both the educational effort and the subsequent development of a national strategy will be greatly eased.

This is not to say that only celebrities of national stature should be engaged in the effort. A respondent from the private sector said that businesses and business organizations (such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers) could play a useful role in educating first teachers, and then students and student groups, about commercial and employment opportunities outside the United States. They could do this most effectively by:

> providing examples of how companies are operating, how we're operating in a global economy, and begin to promote that idea that it is a global workforce and you're going to be working, in general, many, many more of your opportunities for companies are going to be outside of, potentially outside of the U.S., and it's sort of like it's making it more of the norm and helping encourage that idea of more of the norm, versus sort of saying, "Gee, that's an extra sort of unique thing to do," and with this whole idea it just becomes part of how people are going to operate. They could show examples of various companies having to do that.

Once educators and students understand what opportunities are available to those with language and cultural skills, it would be a matter of "getting educators and those organizations together in terms of trying to help educators that are developing curriculum . . . , and understanding how curriculum needs to evolve to reflect some of these things."

Respondents from the Foreign Commercial Service and the Intelligence Community said that if the private sector were more active in expressing making clear its desire for job candidates with language and cultural skills, schools and universities would be prompt to fill the need. One university professor agreed, remarking that both undergraduate and graduate students were keenly aware of any economic advantage to be gained from pursuing a particular course of study. This respondent questioned whether the business community was making its needs clear to academia.

On the other hand, another university professor said that there is "this sort of sense in the current generation of students that to understand the global world is essential

for them to ever get jobs." As already noted, some respondents stated that there is a demand for improved global education that is not being satisfied; and this view has some support in the literature. Structural reasons given for this failure include a lack of resources, a shortage of instructors with the requisite skills and outlook, and resistance from the professoriate. These are impediments that will not be overcome without a widespread consensus on the need for change and support from outside the education system. The respondents seemed to suggest that the requisite consensus could be obtained only with strong leadership. The concept of a "megacommunity" suggests that this leadership should be drawn from government (at all levels, if possible), the business sector, and civil society.

3. **Proponents of a National Strategy for Global Education Must Allay Public and Stakeholder Concerns About Centralized Control of the Content of Education**

Both respondents who favored a national strategy and those who doubted its value or directly opposed it expressed concern that their particular interests or priorities would be overlooked or outweighed in the process of formulating the strategy's goals. This may be the best possible evidence of the competing demands that a national strategy would have to address, and it strongly suggests that the widely distributed planning model of the National Strategy for Homeland Security would be suitable for a national strategy for global education.

The problem was identified bluntly at the federal level. A senior official familiar with language services supporting federal law enforcement and counterintelligence said:

> I think that there needs to be something. But that being said, . . . I hesitate a little bit on the Intelligence Community side, because I don't want them to take over the program for [my agency], I don't want them to be prioritizing my needs because they're not prioritizing the needs that [my agency] really has. [My agency] needs to prioritize for itself. So, you know, if they want to decide that there's a strategy for a particular country, and that we're focusing on that country, I'm happy to add to the pot, if I need to give two or three linguists to help out with the effort. But don't tell me I can't do drugs in Spanish because if that's a priority for [my agency] I've got to be able to do that. . . . I agree that we could probably do a lot of load-smoothing in terms of the priority stuff for the

government, but beyond that there is stuff at each individual agency's level that needs to be done that may not be a priority for the whole but it's a priority for that organization.

. . .

[A national strategy] would have to be very macro because the requirements, other than the fact that everybody needs people who can speak languages, the requirements for law enforcement and intelligence are very different. Which is really the problem that I face a lot, because the Intelligence Community says, "Well, you must do this," and I'm like, "Well, that doesn't work on this side." And they say, "Well, we really don't recognize that side anyway," because they don't, the money comes, you know, the money that pays for the law enforcement side is not under their control.

A Foreign Service Officer addressed the same point, speaking of the benefits of having multiple agencies participating in setting goals. This respondent expressed concern about the possible failure of coordination if a single agency took the lead, and the adverse effect on operations if another agency important to the effort decided it was not on board:

[G]overnment agencies, it seems to me, are often run by Type-A personalities that just have narrow-banded vision of what they're there to accomplish, and it's determined by whatever the agency is. It's not a bad thing, it's very good for the organization, but if you're looking at something like a national strategy, I think you need a shared vision. . . . [Y]ou have the benefit of different perspectives and different needs. And I think it strengthens your case with the public, if different people contribute to that mix. Because they can envision different futures for different kids.

A senior executive of a major urban police department expressed the concern of state and local authorities about federally mandated content. When asked where responsibility should rest for developing a national strategy, this respondent said: "Obviously, up at the federal level, but with state, local, regional collaboration as well. Once again I think you can't just ram things down people's throats; everybody's got to be involved in the process."

As noted previously, a Foreign Service Officer commented on the likelihood of resistance from the education community: "I think the big controversy is having a national policy on education, *punto basta.* That there isn't a school anywhere that really likes having national direction on . . . what they're supposed to teach." Both of the university professors spoke of the same problem, largely for reasons of faculty politics. A respondent from the Intelligence Community also commented at length on the difficulty of supporting educational programs in the absence of clearly defined measures of success:

> [W]e have to stop looking for the single answer to teach culture, okay? Because culture evolves, culture changes on a daily, almost on a daily basis. Where we have some challenge is, the idea that there is a "right" way to teach culture, or that there is a "right" culture to teach. That really gets the knives out. Because I've watched people just really get into arguments over teaching the finer points of Islam. You know, and it's, well, there've been arguments and arguments and arguments about any religion, and how you would teach it. It's not a matter of this is right and this is wrong, it's a matter of, you know, this is what you have to consider when you're dealing with this culture; or these are nuances of the culture that you have to understand. And so, again, I think sometimes we tend to look at things probably in too narrow of a scope, and also when we talk about teaching we immediately go to performance when we say, "Well, you know, it's either A or B or C; there's nothing else. Because we've got to measure what we teach; so there's a right answer and a wrong answer. "You just gave me the wrong answer. No, you do not know the culture!"
>
> Well, that's not what culture's all about. It's not about having a right answer and a wrong answer, it's about being more informed. And that is something that is hard for our school system to deal with, whether it's in the K to 12 or in the universities. It's very hard to say, "Did you get the message?" You know, we're so determined to give a grade or a pass/fail, when really what I want to know is, "Are you a better global citizen than you were before you started the program? Do you understand their perspective better than you did when you walked in here?" You know, that's what it ought to be about, but it's hard to normalize that with our expectations of pass/fail, A, B, 1 through 100.

In an environment where many schools are already struggling with state-mandated achievement tests (such as Virginia's Standards of Learning test)[122] or federally mandated academic assessments (such as those required by the No Child Left Behind Act),[123] it is understandable that education authorities at all levels would be troubled by the imposition of educational requirements or standards in the development of which they did not participate.

Finally, a respondent from the business sector said that the decision-making process should include not only the education sector and government, but possibly our foreign trading partners as well.

> 'Cause we're really talking about how our workforce is going to be most effective. . . . I'm wondering is it, is this an international discussion as well, do you get involvement from EU countries or other, is this a global discussion? . . . How do you do that? You do it saying, they may have a similar problem. And maybe you need to do some research out there. . . . [E]very country maybe has an intrinsic, certain value. We may have certain skills and capabilities and perspectives that can be leveraged over, and other countries will have others."

While it may seem unlikely that any foreign partner would have substantial input into the priorities of U.S. intelligence or law enforcement, it is certainly conceivable that academic, commercial, and nongovernmental organizations operating abroad—or multilateral or multinational entities—would have an interest in discussing with their partners or counterparties what skills each could contribute to carry out their joint efforts most effectively.

In short, respondents in all sectors and at all levels agreed that a national strategy for global education could not successfully be developed and imposed from above, or from any single point. The interests at play, and the objectives of the different stakeholders, are too diverse; in some cases, they conflict. Planning and allocation of resources cannot be carried out by a single decision maker or a decision maker with a single perspective, because no such decision maker could gain the confidence of all of the

---

[122] *See generally* Virginia Code § 22.1-253.13:1; 8 Va. Admin. Code §§ 20-131-30(E), 20–131–110(B).

[123] Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 1111(b)(3), *codified at* 20 U.S.C. § 6311(b)(3).

stakeholders and other participants in the process. Consequently, advocates of a national strategy for global education must assure their stakeholders and the public that while the national effort is guided by a shared vision, decisions about funding and other resources, educational content, and other critical decisions will be devolved and diffused among all those holding an interest. Here again, the National Strategy for Homeland Security can provide an example of an overarching national vision and structure for planning that accommodates the varying interests of multiple stakeholders across sectors, as well as their differing resources.

B. HOW TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION

Virtually all of the respondents believed that a national strategy for global education could not succeed if it were developed by a federal (or other centralized) decision maker. Yet when asked who should be responsible for a national strategy, almost all respondents identified either a federal agency such as the Department of Education, or (by name, title, or general description) some federal official who had the ear of the President, the trust of Congress, and high public recognition. I suggest that this reflects a problem with the term "national strategy," rather than any logical inconsistency. As previously noted, most national strategies of the United States rely primarily or exclusively on federal resources that are subject to national command and control. While this is not true of all national strategies,[124] the term certainly evokes visions of federal planning and direction, and deployment of federal resources.

The respondents' implicit expectation that a national strategy would involve centralized (probably federal) planning and control presumably influenced their answers to the question whether a national strategy would be a useful tool for bringing about needed improvements in global education in the U.S. It certainly informed their answers

---

[124] Consider, for example, the 2007 National Strategy for Information Sharing, which envisions a network of state and local fusion centers as well as sharing information with private-sector and foreign partners.

to the question how a national strategy should be developed. The discussion that follows summarizes the respondents' views, then analyzes them in the context of a "megacommunity."

As with their views on whether a national strategy would be useful, respondents' views on how a national strategy might be developed and who should participate in the process were driven largely by pragmatic considerations. The most comprehensive discussion of how it might work was provided by a professor of international relations, who proposed:

> something where basically the President and whatever the enabling legislation is in Congress would say that anytime anything is concerned with education and research – not just education – that . . . could affect the United States' long-term interests, that everything has to come into conformity with this national strategy. And then you probably need a person who would not be called a "czar" . . . You'd probably need an office of some sort that would be responsible for some monitoring and encouraging people to actually correspond with the strategy. You'd probably need a President who cared a little bit about this. At least in the first instance.

I asked this respondent who would participate in determining the goals of a national strategy.

> I determine them.[125] And then I create a multi-constituency group that will decide that those are what the goals are. . . . You get people from all of the agencies that are concerned with the security of the United States and with the long-term economic viability of the United States. You get representatives from all of them so that there's all these government types, right? And then you get a variety of civil society people, or private sector people who are, actually have vested interests in this but who would buy into the strategy that I've come up with. So that you've got people from the various university associations, because a lot of this is going to be aimed at young people of different sorts; you get people from secondary schools, probably, as well. Because a lot of it's going to involve giving people the opportunities to do work or study of different sorts abroad, you bring in those people who have been doing NGO work for AID, which means bringing in some of those Christian groups and that sort of stuff as part of the group, because they're going to be part of the ones we want to

---

125 By "I," I understood this respondent to mean the person who is given the responsibility of leading the effort to develop and implement a national strategy for global education.

make sure aren't upset about this at the end.[126] And you get a group of representatives of these folks who you've selected by yourself somehow, and they endorse the overall set of goals.

You know, you get companies to come in, certainly. This is going to be terrible because I'm about to tell you that you actually don't get labor. You get some representatives of labor interests that are internationally connected, unions that have an international focus, . . . and get some representation of that group, and you get employers who are internationally focused, sure, but you don't necessarily tell the Chamber of Commerce to give us representatives. You make a selection of individuals. These are all individuals, by the way. You understand: they're there because of their individual capacity, because of their knowledge and their commitment and concern; not because they are representatives of different groups. . . . I think that there's actually more agreement among people who've probably tried to focus on these issues than there might seem to be on the surface. And that you've got people like that all over the place, in all of the constituency groups.

I do actually think you need something that comes out that Congress and the President say, we are creating this commission, the President appoints these people who come from all these different places but we appoint them all as individuals, they come up with goals, you have a couple of people who are really good politically in the sense that they work well with Congress, and you try to translate the Commission goals into a legislative agenda that reforms some existing acts without changing their names – one of the things you never do is actually changing the Fulbright Program, right? You make the Fulbright Program better and all those sorts of things. But if they work with, you get the goal-setting by this multi-person, this multi-constituency but individual group, and then they work closely with legislative leaders and with the President to come up with a set of legislative amendments and some fundamentally new legislation. And this office that has a right to poke its nose into everything inside the U.S. government and to make suggestions backed by this strong group of people in Congress and the President.

---

[126] In the context of the larger interview, this statement was less cynical than it may sound. In response to the question whether a national strategy might impose an obligation of national service in return for education assistance to individuals, this respondent pointed out that the U.S. Agency for International Development already supports the development and aid work of Christian, Jewish, and Muslim charities (excluding proselytizing efforts); "in fact, now the bulk of the organizations that AID gives money to are Christian organizations. . . . [E]ven though there's been this big shift in funding in [recent] years, there's been no increase in the number of Americans going abroad in proselytizing roles." A service obligation could be defined "in exactly the same way as you define the money that's going to NGOs from AID."

I also asked this respondent how the decision maker would set the goals of a national strategy. One suggestion was to project the divergence between international demographic trends and domestic study trends, with an eye on pragmatic geopolitical realities. For example, according to this respondent, Spanish is the foreign language most commonly studied in the United States, whereas the Muslim world has the fastest growing population, and will continue to do so for at least a generation.

> We're making projections of various trends and trying to see the mismatch, if there is a mismatch, between trends of areas where the United States is likely to have interests in the future, and where we are developing cultural and intellectual skills. I mean, honestly, some of this, I think, is quite simple. Like if you just do simple population trends? When the students who are current students at American undergraduate colleges are in their 50s and 60s, Pakistan will be a more populous country than the United States of America. So, I mean that's just a real simple sort of thing. Which suggests that, given that that's one of, if you think of countries that are countries with significant technical skills and who culturally for a variety of reasons there are a lot of things, a lot of people that don't particularly like the United States of America, at least at the moment, that would, that's probably one of the kinds of places that there would probably be significant issues. . . .
>
> [Y]ou know . . . , if you sort of follow the demographic transition, the places that are going to continue to grow in population very, very, very rapidly through the lives of the generation that is now in college, are almost all places that are Muslim . . . . And they also tend to be, a lot of them tend to be places that the United States doesn't have much sophisticated knowledge of. So that, that's, I'm sure there are other issues that are, if, you know, you take into account things like what the global economy's going to look like, and all sorts of other things, that there will be other places, too, which I don't know about. So that, you know, we need lots of people who know how to speak Arabic, and Somali, and various important languages like that. . . .
>
> . . .
>
> I think we really do have to, even if we work with the existing structure, we've got to go through some kind of process of identifying a set of national goals that is articulated by the Congress and the President and that everybody has to somehow respond to. I really think that that's essential.

Although some of this outline could fairly be described as somewhat cynical, it certainly contains many of the basic elements for developing a national strategy. This respondent clearly identifies who would be the public face of the effort; posits the need for and general content of enabling legislation; describes how the overarching goals of a strategy would be identified, who would be chosen to ratify them, and why; and states the basis for a methodology of how some of the program's objectives could be determined. These are all issues that need to be addressed *at some level,* although the respondents generally indicated that not all of the answers should or could be provided by a single, central decision maker.

1.   Who Leads the Effort?

The respondent quoted above suggested that the responsibility for leading the effort to develop and implement a national strategy should be given to an individual (not to be called an education "czar") who has statutory authority to oversee and monitor compliance with the strategy.[127]   This person would ideally be someone close to (and probably appointed by) the President, who can maintain good relations with Congress, and who can articulate a vision of where the nation as a whole should be going in the field of global education.

As outlined in Chapter IV.A.2, above (discussing the enlistment of public figures to help raise public awareness of the need), many of the respondents agreed with this general view. One respondent familiar with federal law enforcement and counterintelligence said, "[M]any of us feel that there should have been a language czar, or a person who, you know, was an advisor to the President. . . . I think there should be somebody at a very high level who could brief, maybe not the President but the Vice President or somebody, because the state of the . . . country's foreign language posture really determines whether or not we have diplomacy with countries, whether our economy works because of all the global economic, the globalization of all these companies . . ."

---

[127] Less optimistically, a respondent familiar with Defense programs said that if legislation establishing a national language council were placed before Congress, it would probably be ignored as such proposals have been in the past.

Unlike most of the other respondents, the academic quoted at length above did not seem to feel that the leader or public face of program needed to be drawn from present or former government figures, as long as that individual was otherwise able to perform the duties of the job. Indeed, the literature suggests that the business sector is in a better position than either government or civil society to initiate a "megacommunity," except "when top political figures pick up issues as 'pet projects,' or a particular amount of funding is set aside for a specific issue, or when an issue is simply too huge to be handled by any other entity."[128] The initiator of a "megacommunity" should, however, "have standing, a pre-existing reputation and relationships that can help get the megacommunity off the ground"[129]—in other words, should be the kind of well known public figure described by the various respondents.

Public and professional sensitivity to the prospect of federal or centralized control of education, the political risks of having a national strategy identified with a single political party, and the anticipated need to demonstrate the economic benefits of a national strategy suggest that the initiation of a "megacommunity" should be undertaken by a representative of the private sector. The subject of this national strategy has national and homeland security implications, however; reliance on the private sector to initiate the necessary engagement across sectors might give rise to concerns that security considerations may not be given adequate weight.

The answer to this concern is two-fold. First, "An initiator is not a codeword for a megacommunity CEO. Nor is it a role that necessarily continues once the megacommunity is established. But, it is the most visible leadership role in a megacommunity's embryonic stages."[130] This confirms the judgment of all of the respondents that the public face of the effort, particularly in the stages of public and

---

[128] Gerencser, Kelly, Napolitano, and Van Lee, *op. cit.,* 113–17.

[129] Ibid*.,* 121.

[130] Ibid*.,* 113.

stakeholder education, needed to have "star power."[131] Second, following the model of the National Strategy for Homeland Security, neither the initiator of the "megacommunity" nor the "megacommunity" itself would be setting priorities or making decisions for its components. Decision-making and allocation of resources would be distributed among the stakeholders within the framework of a national cooperative strategy with a defined set of goals, a common language, and a working structure. Ideally, no participant in the "megacommunity" should be in a position to override the priorities of any other participant; all participants should be able to make some progress toward meeting their own objectives.

2.   Who Participates in the Effort?

Without prompting, some of the respondents identified organizations that could usefully—or as a matter of necessity—be recruited to participate in the development of a national strategy. This suggests an implicit recognition that the participants in the discussion are not at the table solely because of their individual ability to make a contribution, but because they represent important constituencies whose participation in the process and endorsement of the outcome are important to the success of the effort. In other words, it implies recognition that the engagement of a "megacommunity" may be the most effective way to develop and implement a national strategy. Remember that "a megacommunity is a public sphere in which organizations from three sectors—business, government, and civil society—deliberately join together around compelling issues of mutual importance, following a set of practices and principles that make it easier for them to achieve results without sacrificing their individual goals. We chose the term

---

[131] "A great megacommunity leader needs to embrace, not just accept, the challenge of working in a larger, more complex sphere of influence. For this reason, the most successful leaders of the future may be those with career paths through all three sectors, either migrating through business, government, and the civil sectors during their careers, or serving on boards of organizations in other sectors." Ibid, 194–95.

megacommunity to reflect such a sphere's character as a gathering place, not of individuals, but of organizations."[132] This seems to have been the vision that informed the suggestions of some respondents.

A respondent from the Intelligence Community identified the Defense Department as the driver for most of the Community's language priorities, but suggested that the Director of National Intelligence had a role to play in ensuring that other voices are heard: "I think we can look at, you know, the 800-pound gorilla in the room, who does tend to be the DoD, and say, 'Okay, while you're doing this, you still have to maintain a bench strength, you still have to maintain a capability,' you know. And this is where I think the DNI doesn't wag the tail but the DNI can certainly grab a hold of it and hold tightly, and say, 'Okay, I'm going to allow you to do this amount over here, but don't go below this.'"

A senior executive from an urban police department looked to professional associations representing state and local law enforcement. "If you were to get law enforcement actively involved in any initiative . . . , you're really got to get the buy-in of a few organizations that represent law enforcement. IACP, Major Cities Chiefs Association, some of your major sheriffs' groups, potentially NOBLE . . . , so there's a few key groups that really represent the law enforcement body. And I think if you get all of those groups to come together and say this is important . . . , then they'll come up with a collaborative strategy to guide that forward."

A Foreign Service Officer saw federal agencies as a first resource not only to help develop goals, but also to rally public support:

> Maybe my first stop would be the Cabinet. And looking at, you know, Secretary of Education, looking at Labor, and looking at the Department of State, for example, a sort of multi-fronted governmental approach in which each sort of segment could describe the benefits of this kind of educational component. And then using that to make arguments to both the people, because if people start to clamor for something when you

---

[132] "A great megacommunity leader needs to embrace, not just accept, the challenge of working in a larger, more complex sphere of influence. For this reason, the most successful leaders of the future may be those with career paths through all three sectors, either migrating through business, government, and the civil sectors during their careers, or serving on boards of organizations in other sectors." Ibid*.,* 53.

make your pitch to Congress they're more likely to say yes if there is already widespread public acceptance and the desire for something. . . . I think if you link as one of your arguments, you know, that in a globalized world our children are absolutely going to have to have certain skills in order to, not just survive but also succeed, parents will listen in a very special way. And parents vote, parents pay taxes, and that, I think, gets the attention of Congress. But I'd probably start with some sort of presentation or multidirectional shots from the agencies or segments or Cabinet positions most directly involved.

A respondent from the private sector agreed. In that respondent's view, the principal selling point and end product of a national strategy would be a better educated and more effective workforce. Consequently, the important participants in designing the strategy would be "[t]he education sector and the government. Well, Labor, Education, Commerce. It's all that." Interestingly, when it was pointed out that "labor, education, and commerce" could be understood to mean either three federal agencies or three components of the private sector, the respondent clarified that the federal agencies were intended, and expressed some doubt about the role of organized labor in the development of a national strategy.

A Foreign Service Officer agreed that in the private sector, the most significant player in a national strategy would be the educational community:

So you'd have to figure out some way of not only getting them to buy in, but also getting them to determine how best to implement, I don't think you just sort of put it on their plate and say, "Do this." Especially when you're dealing with academics, . . . there will be all sorts of chatter about curriculum, and how many units, and all of this stuff, but you want them in from the beginning, so that they're already focused on sort of greasing the skids, . . . as opposed to setting up obstacles or just despairing. "You know, this will never work, you know, we can't do this," and in fact, of course you can, if you approach it from, if you front-load the process. So that, I'd say the educational community. And also they have a vested interest in producing students who can find jobs.

Somewhat surprisingly, only three respondents expressly stated that the business sector should participate in developing a national strategy. A respondent familiar with Defense language programs said that it would be necessary to engage both academics and representatives of private enterprise with global contacts; as noted above, a university

professor suggested that sympathetic, individual businesspeople might participate in setting the goals of a national strategy; and a respondent from the private sector said that the business community had an important part to play. Other respondents simply suggested that the private sector should make its interest in global education clearer to students and universities. I suggest that the lack of broader interest in direct participation by the private sector may have resulted from the presumed government (and federal) connotations of the term "national strategy." That is a question that may warrant further study.

The respondents did, however, make it clear that they expected the discussion of a national strategy to take place among groups representing various constituencies. These constituencies included federal, state, and local agencies, and nongovernmental organizations (that is, civil society). Although the respondents did not specifically identify business entities or associations, this model approaches the vision of the National Strategy for Homeland Security in its inclusion of all stakeholders in the planning process. In my opinion, this reinforces the view that the development of a national strategy for global education can best be achieved through a process like the engagement of a megacommunity.

3.   How Are the Goals Determined?

One of the things that I found most surprising in the course of these interviews was the belief shared by many respondents that it would not be conceptually difficult to project the nation's needs for specific foreign language skills and cultural competencies. In fact, one respondent said that a regular review of language needs is already built into Department of Defense policy. As this respondent put it, "You take all of the national security and military guidance from the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, DIA, the Joint Chiefs, about 15 to 20 documents, and you take the futures studies that are performed by private institutions, intelligence, government, and you try to build a picture of the world in 2015, 2020, 2025." Within that picture, one looks for the places that are likely to experience great instability or regime change that will lead to instability, or such things as water or energy shortages, or

the situations such as the conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan. One then identifies those areas where U.S. national interests (including the presence of NGOs, major investments, etc.) are exposed to risk; assigns them priority; determines the official and common languages of the country; and starts to project the staffing levels for various types of missions (military, diplomatic, humanitarian, etc.), including the need for language skills in specialized fields. From this process emerges a list of areas for which we need practitioners with language and cultural skills right now, in the next 10 years, and out to 2025.

Similarly, a respondent familiar with law enforcement and counterintelligence programs said the people doing the work of translation "get an idea of what the trends are, because they can see certain languages ramping up" in the workload. In addition, they look for geopolitical trends in open source materials such as newspapers, look at what intelligence reports are forecasting, "and then we take a look at what we see on a regular basis. Because sometimes what's going on in the world is not necessarily reflected for us . . . . Because we're here [in the U.S.], we're domestic." This respondent predicted that Arabic, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish would continue to be staples for domestic law enforcement and counterintelligence in the long term. "[E]ven Farsi, I mean, I just don't see Farsi as a big language need for us 30 years from now."

A university professor agreed. "I don't think it's that difficult to predict which languages are going to be important, because economic and military power doesn't change that rapidly. Russia, China, the Middle East, the Spanish-speaking world—this isn't a huge problem."

A respondent from the business sector also agreed, although that respondent's focus, unsurprisingly, was on trade: "[B]egin to look at saying what countries, where is the biggest need going to be? Sometimes we talk about the BRICK countries.[133] Where's the global, when we talk about global, where's the biggest global impact going to be, who are going to be the big, global players in the future? And then begin to look at

---

133 That is, Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Korea. *See, e.g.,* China Martens, "IBM targets Russian developers: Big Blue focusing on emerging markets with initiative aimed at attracting Russian developers," *InfoWorld* (February 3, 2006), available on line at http://www.infoworld.com/d/developer-world/ibm-targets-russian-developers-507 (accessed October 13, 2011).

languages and all that, that need to be in place." When asked whether these are things that could reasonably be projected 20 years out, this respondent said, "I think so. I think you can see the trends out there."

Likewise, a Foreign Commercial Service Officer suggested that the determination of what languages to support in a national strategy could begin with the private sector: "[Y]ou could, through various associations or professional groups do surveys of members as to what languages they think will be in demand by their companies and their members." This would be a business estimate much the same as projecting the anticipated need for physicians, nurses, or teachers. Government could also make such projections for its own workforce needs using relatively simple resource allocation models based on a country's population, its gross domestic product, and similar indicators of trade potential.

A Foreign Service Officer agreed that trend analysis in various disciplines can help determine the nation's needs. But this respondent also expressed concern that representatives of the U.S. abroad were not always able to focus their attention on populations or subcultures who merit attention:

> [T]here's a lot of attention that's being focused on the Middle East and, you know, Arabic speaking Muslim countries, and trying to figure out ways of engaging these populations, but I think that some of our energy has to be devoted to looking at successor generations of Muslims in Western Europe. If you do an analysis, all 19 of the 9/11 hijackers were people who had spent considerable amount of time in Western Europe before coming to our country to do the things that they did. They did not come directly from the Middle East to America. You know, they spent time in Western Europe. And that's a problem, I think, for us as diplomats. Because normally what we deal with in societies are pretty much the elites. You know, you'll deal with the politicians, you'll deal with the newspaper editors, the university rectors, but there's almost no way for you to deal with the high school dropout lover of hip-hop music who lives in, you know, a suburb outside of Paris, for example. And yet this is the person who can cause, who can wreak havoc.

> 9/11 has obviously focused us on the Muslim, Arabic-speaking world. Economics has focused us on China. Population growth has focused us on the Spanish-speaking world. So I think there are things that you look at in terms of trends or important issues, things that are important for our

country. Economics isn't going anywhere, we're always going to need international organizations and partnerships for the things that are going on in the world in which we live. So I think, not exclusively, but I think those very practical concerns that lead to those decisions. I don't think that there is, you know, a cut-and-dried formula that you can use. There are degrees of relative importance, and relationships between countries work on several levels.

A respondent from the Intelligence Community agreed that trend analysis would be a useful tool, but was wary of the risks of long-term planning in an unpredictably changing world:

> [W]e should be able to come up with a methodology where we can look at our historic trends, to determine what the core component of that is that we can program toward, to meet. So if we did a five-year lookback and said that we've got x amount of data in different, in Arabic and dialects that needs to be processed, we should be able to then use that lookback to program forward and say, "At least at a core I know that 60% of my agency's level of effort has gone against this target for the past five years; therefore I am going to forward project that level of effort for the next five years." .. [T]hat's an indication of what you have collected, it's an indication of the type of work that you do have sitting in front of you, and if you can do a historical analysis you can certainly predict with a certain amount of accuracy a core piece of that that will continue forward. I mean, even if you go completely off the topic toward, say, counterdrug, you could do a historical analysis to say, well, 80% of our drug activity has come from Blah. So based on the fact that that's historically accurate over the last 20 years, I think we are fairly safe projecting our requirements forward five. You should be able to do that and come up with a methodology that makes it fairly accurate and with a process that you can stand up and defend and articulate.

On the other hand, said this respondent, the government requires the ability to adapt quickly to emergencies and other unforeseen changes in requirements. For example, if "all of the collection systems, all of the production requirements, the analysts, if they're all staring at one target today, called Iraq, how quickly can we take that entire mass and move it over to China or North Korea or Iran? Well, if I'm a collection system, I'm agnostic to language and I can move, I can point a satellite another direction, I can take a remote collection platform and I can start bringing in ones and zeroes tomorrow. But I have a much longer lead time in order to be able to process the ones and zeroes."

This respondent also warned that while institutions need to plan for their future needs, they must also prepare for the possibility that they may be wrong. "If we spend all of this money on Iraq today, then we have to be prepared to accept this amount of risk in the other areas tomorrow." That is a *caveat* that should not be underestimated. Projections are only that: educated estimates—sometimes highly educated, but estimates nonetheless—of what the future world will be like and what our needs will be. The participants in a "megacommunity" engaged to improve global education should be prepared not only to forecast the Nation's needs, but also to assess the risks of error, and to determine the degree of risk that is acceptable. If nothing else, this concern suggests yet another reason why the Nation may benefit by supporting numerous languages under a national strategy: if government (in its various functions), the private sector, and civil society need workforces trained in the languages and cultural skills of many countries to succeed, the likelihood is greater that the educational institutions and resources, and the trained personnel, will be available in the event that one sector makes a serious error in projecting its particular needs.

To summarize: there was broad agreement among the respondents that it is possible to estimate more or less accurately, over a longer or shorter period, what the nation's needs for language and cultural skills will be; and many of the respondents were able to suggest models for making such estimates. Even within the federal government there appeared to be little agreement on what those needs were, because agencies with different responsibilities had substantially different interests. The differences in needs—and the sources of raw data underpinning models for projecting the needs—were even more pronounced across sectors. In my opinion, this reinforces the view that a national strategy cannot rely on central planning, but must provide for distributed planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

4. Discussion

During the course of the interviews, it became clear that a number of the respondents were professionally acquainted, and had discussed among themselves many of the same issues addressed in this paper. In addition, many were professionally

involved with, or had business contacts with, a number of professional associations that have an interest in a workforce with improved language skills and cultural competence. Not all respondents attached the same value to this interest, but all of them were members of extensive networks whose members had given the issue some consideration. While the respondents' acquaintance undoubtedly resulted in part from the fact that they were part of a convenience sample, their larger networks are also evidence that the constituents of a latent "megacommunity" already exist.

"A megacommunity might already exist—in a latent state—as a result of the presence of an overlapping set of issues. Most likely, this latent megacommunity will have reached a threshold at which the value of cross-sector action is evident. But, the megacommunity will not move from latent to active on its own."[134] How is that point recognized? "[W]hen each separate constituency affected by any issue realizes that its progression has achieved a plateau or roadblock, when any additional effort does not produce further improvement."[135] Have the stakeholders in improved global education reached that point?

Perhaps. All but one of the respondents agreed that more resources should be devoted to the improvement of global education in the United States. Several of the respondents have developed the better part of their professional careers to bringing about this improvement, but are not satisfied with the results. On the other hand, it was also clear that the organizations represented by the respondents had internal differences of opinion concerning the importance of the issue. Not all members of the business community, the law enforcement community, and the education community, for example, saw the need for, or the benefits of, change. Among those who do, there are sharp differences in priorities and a mistrust of overregulation or interference. None of the respondents saw a clear way forward; most thought that the development of a national strategy might help. Why, then, have advocates for global education in government, the business community, and civil society not joined to advance their common interest?

---

[134] Gerencser, Kelly, Napolitano, and Van Lee, *op. cit.,* 113.

[135] Ibid*.,* 70.

"Although tools such as the Internet enable more channels of communication among the three sectors, the members do not normally come together on an active megacommunity level of their own accord. *They are kept apart by their own constituents, by the aspects of their goals that are at cross-purposes, and by their perceptions of each other.* If active complete megacommunities did spontaneously evolve, we would have many more today than we do. Their scarcity is a clear indication that they need both a deliberate catalyst and a fundamental formula."[136] This is a concise description both of the obstacles to a cross-sector alliance to improve global education, and of the way forward.

I am not in a position to identify prospective initiators for a global education "megacommunity" more clearly than the respondents have already done. I do suggest, however, that the private sector is in a better position to initiate the cross-sector engagement than a representative of civil society. "NGO leaders may indeed find themselves cast in the initiator role when it comes to megacommunities that form around social and environmental issues, issues that tend to stem from a culture of altruism and are fueled by personal passion." It quickly became clear from the interviews that many of the respondents believed strongly in the value of language skills and cultural competence for a variety of reasons; they could fairly be described as having a passion for these disciplines.[137] But none of them believed that these skills were important for purely or even largely altruistic reasons; all of them argued that global education is important because it contributes to the security and economic well-being of the Nation and its citizens (although respondents from different sectors may have differed in their views of what constituted security and economic well-being). Finally, a number of the respondents recognized the social implications of a national strategy for global education. As one Foreign Service Officer said, "I think the idea of universal opportunity is attractive to most Americans. I think that language learning, cross-cultural training, opportunities to be part of this brave new linguistic and cultural world should not be

---

[136] Gerencser, Kelly, Napolitano, and Van Lee, *op. cit.,* 113. (emphasis added).

[137] "[T]here is one primary personal quality that a megacommunity leader must have. That single element is passion. . . . Through passion and conviction, a leader becomes inspirational. Passion is the hallmark of an honest broker." Ibid*.,* 213–14.

limited to kids who are you know, either scholarship students or whose families don't have the resources." But these social benefits of a national strategy were, in the main, viewed as collateral to the central issue of advancing the national interest. None of the respondents described global education as a "social or environmental issue."

Likewise, I do not have the institutional knowledge that would allow me to identify more thoroughly than the respondents who should participate in a global education "megacommunity."[138] I suggest, however, that the initiation of such a "megacommunity" need not be delayed until every conceivable stakeholder or participant is identified. "Stakeholders will change over time. A healthy megacommunity is adaptable, growing and shrinking as its goals warrant. By the very nature of problem solving, collaboration, and life, new stakeholders will always be arriving on the scene, while others will leave."[139] Moreover, even a well supported initiator from the private sector may not be able to identify at the outset all of the stakeholders who may have an interest in this initiative, particularly in the Intelligence Community. Certainly in the early stages of "megacommunity" formation, "[c]ore stakeholders can be identified and asked to join the process of initiation,"[140] including the function of public and stakeholder education. Additional stakeholders can be identified in an iterative process. As the economy becomes increasingly globalized and America's security interests are increasingly affected by events in every part of the world, delay in the development of a national strategy does not serve the national interest.

We have seen that the respondents believe it is possible to project with some accuracy what the nation's needs for language skills and cultural competence will be for at least five years, and possibly considerably longer. Their informal estimates, however, vary considerably according to the interests they represent: the law enforcement and counterintelligence communities, for example, see a need for Arabic and Spanish, while the business community sees a need for Hindi and Korean. There are areas of overlap

---

[138] The literature suggests that the business sector will be in the best position to identify "the *widest* possible cross-section of stakeholders imaginable." Ibid*.,* 127 (emphasis original). This seems to reinforce the notion that the initiator of a global education "megacommunity" should come from the private sector.

[139] Ibid*.,* 133.

[140] Ibid*.,* 137.

(e.g., Chinese and Russian), which may give rise to economies of scale, but their priorities are by no means coextensive. The overarching goal, however, is to improve global education in the U.S. To accomplish that through a joint effort, each member of the "megacommunity" must give "a commitment to organize on behalf of the whole. As part of this commitment, there must be a commitment of time and personnel as well. When people in the megacommunity try to understand what optimizing means to them, they will be looking for evidence that others have made a commitment and understand how to keep it. Thus, there must be a commitment to openly share all information central to the vital interest at hand."[141]

There are many ways this principle could be put into practice. A respondent from the business community suggested, for example, that the powerful analytic capabilities of the government could be used to supplement the analyses already carried out by the private sector to determine the ways in which the U.S. workforce could compete most effectively in a global economy, perhaps even to the point of repatriating jobs that had previously been outsourced to other countries.[142] It is equally conceivable that commercial analyses could be fed into the planning models of government agencies or NGOs (with suitable protections for proprietary information). It is beyond the scope of this paper to enumerate all the ways in which the members of a global education "megacommunity" could cooperate. It seems clear, however, that this is the framework of the National Strategy for Homeland Security, and could also be the basis upon which to build a national strategy for global education.

---

[141] The literature suggests that the business sector will be in the best position to identify "the *widest* possible cross-section of stakeholders imaginable." Ibid*.,* 127 (emphasis original). This seems to reinforce the notion that the initiator of a global education "megacommunity" should come from the private sector. Ibid*..,* 154.

[142] Obviously, any such analysis would have to be sanitized of any classified or sensitive information.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V.   WHAT SHOULD BE THE GOALS OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY?

One of the original aims of this study was to determine what goals a national strategy for global education should seek to achieve.   It should be clear from the preceding discussion that there is very little agreement on what the specific, operational goals of a strategy should be.   The varying needs, priorities, and capabilities of the parties with an interest in the outcome preclude such agreement.   On the other hand, the example of the National Strategy for Homeland Security demonstrates that meaningful change can be effected without national agreement on specific objectives, provided that there is an agreed set of goals broadly describing a desired end state, and an agreed framework within which decisions can be made about setting goals, allocating resources, and coordinating efforts.

The National Strategy for Homeland Security contains the following statement of vision—that is, the desired end state:[143]

> The United States, through a concerted national effort that galvanizes the strengths and capabilities of Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments; the private and non-profit sectors; and regions, communities, and individual citizens – along with our partners in the international community – will work to achieve a secure Homeland that sustains our way of life as a free, prosperous, and welcoming America.

It is harder to imagine a broader statement of intent than this, unless it is the statement of "our strategy for homeland security:"[144]

> In order to realize this vision, the United States will use all instruments of national power and influence – diplomatic, information, military, economic, financial, intelligence, and law enforcement – to achieve our goals to prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks; protect the American people, critical infrastructure, and key resources; and respond to and recover from

---

[143] *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (2007), 13.

[144] Ibid.

incidents that do occur. We also will continue to create, strengthen, and transform the principles, systems, structures, and institutions we need to secure our Nation over the long term.

Yet, this broad vision of an end state, and the accompanying list of five overarching objectives, gave rise to an influential national structure that fostered the development of security policies and planning guidance, a system for developing operational plans from that guidance, the execution of those plans, and an iterative process of review and improvement.[145] To some extent, the respondents in this study expressed a similar view: a broad vision of a desired end state and a few overarching objectives.

A. VISION STATEMENT

The first (and most recent) Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) articulated a strategic vision of a Nation that was profoundly committed both to the stability and prosperity of the international community, and to its own ability to maintain its place as a leader of that community:[146]

> America's interests are inextricably linked to the integrity and resilience of the international system. Chief among these interests are security, prosperity, broad respect for universal values, and an international order that promotes cooperative action. Consistent with the President's vision, the United States will advance these interests by strengthening our domestic foundation and integrating all elements of national power, engaging abroad on the basis of mutual interest and mutual respect, and promoting an international order that reinforces the rights and responsibilities of all nations.

Among the threats to the national interest identified in the QHSR is "Economic and financial instability that can undermine confidence in the international order, fuel global political turbulence, and induce social and political instability in weak states abroad" (emphasis original).[147]

---

[145] *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (2007), 42–46.

[146] U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland* (Washington: U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, February 2010), 5, available on line at http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf (accessed October 19, 2011).

[147] Ibid*.,* 7 (emphasis original).

In their consideration of the goals of a national strategy, none of the respondents went so far as to verbalize a strategic vision. In considering the benefits of a national strategy for global education, however, all of the respondents spoke in terms closely related to those of the QHSR. The outcomes they envisioned concerned maintaining the Nation's leadership position, or at the very least its ability to compete successfully, in all arenas important to the national well being. According to the respondents' particular interests, these included the realms of national and homeland defense and security (including diplomacy,[148] the collection and analysis of intelligence, domestic law enforcement and counterintelligence, and the projection of armed force), the economy (including the prosperity of both commercial enterprise and the domestic work force), and education.

Considering a national strategy for global education as an adjunct to the QHSR, one might propose a vision statement along the following lines:

> The United States will work with partners at all levels of government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and individuals, to ensure that its citizens acquire the language skills and cultural competence needed to engage with other countries in pursuit of the security and prosperity of the Nation.

I do not suggest that this is the only possible vision statement consistent with the respondents' proposed goals and the QHSR, nor is it necessarily the best. For example, a vision statement might well refer not only to security and prosperity, but also to the national interests in "broad respect for universal values, and an international order that promotes cooperative action" identified in the QHSR. Those interests, however, appear to be politically controversial at the moment;[149] and while they may suggest the advisability of a national strategy, they certainly do not have the urgency or more

---

[148] As Clausewitz famously wrote, "War is a mere continuation of policy by other means" (*Der Krieg ist eine bloße Fortsetzung der Politik mit anderen Mitteln.*)

[149] "[President Obama's] foreign policy approach has made him critics on the right, who say his one-of-the-gang approach has diminished America's stature in the world; and on the left, who view his embrace of drone strikes as a violation of his pledge to restore the rule of law to national security." Scott Wilson and Karen DeYoung, "Limited intervention contrasts Obama with Bush," *Washington Post,* October 21, 2011.

universal appeal of security and prosperity. I therefore find it prudent to omit those interests from the vision statement in the hope of precluding unnecessary opposition, and offer this version as a potential starting point for further consideration.

B.   GOALS AND METHODS

When asked to describe the potential goals or objectives of a national strategy, most respondents offered both goals and methods of achieving those goals. While there was general agreement that needed language and cultural skills could be projected for at least some period according to the varying needs and priorities of the different stakeholders, there was little agreement on what the assessment criteria should be, and resistance to the notion that one sector's needs should be subordinated to those of another.

There emerged from the interviews, however, a number of themes that were either supported by a number of respondents or were consistent with more generally supported suggestions. These themes could be used for some of the high-level, strategic goals of a national strategy for global education; or, at another level, as descriptions of the methods that might be used to achieve those goals. The broad, overarching goals of a national strategy, suggested by the respondents, include:

1. Ensuring that all students in the U.S. educational system have the opportunity to receive an education that permits them to acquire the skills needed to meet the Nation's needs.

2. Accurately projecting what language and cultural skills the Nation's workforce will need in all sectors on a continuing basis.

Several additional considerations were offered in connection with how these goals might be achieved:

3. Education and training must focus not only on language skills, but on cultural competence as well.

4. In projecting future needs for language and cultural skills, analysts must bear in mind both the needs of government and those of the private sector, including those who constitute the U.S. workforce.

5. There are some existing federal institutions that function effectively to provide global education or cross-cultural research. A national strategy should interfere as little as possible with those institutions.

6. In order to ensure that Americans understand the benefits, and take advantage, of improved global education programs, there may need to be some visible, tangible benefits to provide incentives for participation in language and cultural education.

Finally, the respondents offered two important considerations that, because of the way in which the human brain acquires language skills, fall somewhere into the area between goals and methods:

7. Language training should begin as early as practical because (a) the acquisition of new language and related skills takes time, (b) children generally find it easier to learn languages than adults, and (c) people who have learned more than one language generally find it easier to acquire additional languages than those who have not.

8. Ideally, education in a foreign language and culture will include direct exposure to that language and culture in its native environment.

These goals and methods are discussed in more detail below. There are two additional points, however, that need to be kept in mind.

First is the emphasis on distributed decision making. The National Strategy for Homeland Security and its related documents made very clear the federal government's recognition that some 85% of the Nation's critical infrastructure and key resources are privately owned, and that homeland security planning required a collaborative effort with state, local, and tribal government, the private sector, and civil society. Specifically, the 2007 National Strategy spoke of the requirement that planning be "coordinated with

relevant stakeholders, consistent with the fundamental roles and responsibilities of local, Tribal, State, and Federal governments," and that "all homeland security partners should develop a planning capability."[150]

When Congress established the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, it directed that the Review be "a comprehensive examination of the homeland security strategy of the Nation," to be conducted "in consultation with . . . State, local, and tribal government officials, members of Congress, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts."[151] The QHSR itself speaks of the need for "unity of effort across all participants in the homeland security enterprise,"[152] describes at some length how the homeland security enterprise is to be strengthened and matured,[153] and explains the process by which the Department of Homeland Security solicited "comments" from, and attempted "sustained engagement" with, various stakeholders.[154] Nonetheless, in a recent report, GAO found a need for improved stakeholder engagement, including giving stakeholders more time to prepare their input; better mechanisms for obtaining, disseminating, and acting on input from nonfederal stakeholders; and a clearer definition of stakeholder roles and responsibilities in the QHSR itself.[155] Recognizing that DHS was under statutory pressure to complete the QHSR promptly, it is still a matter of some concern that GAO found weaknesses in the mechanisms for stakeholder engagement—and that DHS concurred.[156] Engagement of the private sector and civil society is critical to the success of the National Strategy for Homeland Security, and will be critical to the success of a national strategy for global education. So is engagement of state, local, and

---

[150] *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (2007)*,* 43.

[151] Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-53, § 2401(a), 121 Stat. 266, 543–45 (2007), *codified at* 6 U.S.C. § 347(a)(1), (3)(C).

[152] U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland* (Washington: U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, February 2010), 34–35.

[153] Ibid.*,* 65–75.

[154] Ibid.*,* B–1 to B–6.

[155] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review: Enhanced Stakeholder Consultation and Use of Risk Information Could Strengthen Future Reviews,* No. GAO-11-873 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2011), 13–29.

[156] Ibid.*,* 59–60.

tribal government. As a respondent from the Intelligence Community said, "[A]t the [federal] government level it's very hard to develop the pipeline because your pipeline is essentially the public education system."

Second is the need to recognize that the Nation will have to devote additional resources to global education, at all levels. Improvements to global education in the U.S. will not come without effort and expense. Yet we are currently faced with the prospect of economic insecurity and a lack of public confidence in both public and private financial institutions. Those who lead the effort will very probably have to keep reminding their constituents that the cost is an investment that will ultimately pay dividends in the form of enhanced homeland security, national security, and a healthier domestic economy. It is also likely that they will have to demonstrate incremental progress toward those ends.

1. **Goal: Ensure That All Students in the U.S. Education System Have the Opportunity to Receive an Education That Permits Them to Acquire the Skills Needed to Meet the Nation's Needs**

This goal embraces several elements that should be recognized individually in order to facilitate development of a strategy. The object is to build an education system (a) that provides the opportunity for any U.S. student who wants it (b) to receive global education (c) that will produce consistently over time (d) a workforce that is adequately educated in accordance with the Nation's projected needs, and (e) is available to all stakeholders, including government at all levels, the private sector, and civil society.

Several of the respondents stated, and most of the other respondents implicitly agreed, that the desired outcome of improved global education (whether or not the improvements are guided by a national strategy) is a U.S. workforce that has the skills to compete successfully in the world, whether the arena of competition is homeland (or national) security or the national economy. Several respondents spoke of a "pipeline" of job candidates. One university professor said that the object was to "[t]ry to increase dramatically the number of Americans who are proficient, culturally proficient and

109

proficient in languages that are . . . relevant to things that are sometimes perceived as security issues for the United States." This respondent added:

> [T]he intelligence services are not going to be served by having it very, very difficult for them to find really, really smart people who also have the various cultural skills. . . . And the only way we're going to get those kind of people there is by educating lots and lots and lots of people . . . to have those skills so that some of those people will actually come out and not turn out to be concert pianists or whatever. Not go into some other field, but get so excited about the fact that they're doing this intercultural stuff that they end up in the CIA. So that's my argument. You need many, many more people to get really, really good intelligence. Also: you also need many, many more people as citizens in order to make intelligent decisions about who to vote for.

A respondent from the Intelligence Community similarly commented:

> [I]f we have a healthy public education system K to 12, and we have a healthy academic environment beyond 12th, then I think we have the type of development and pipeline that the government would want to recruit from. If all of these systems are operating at peak performance or, you know, aligned to really develop people who can think critically, who can . . . you know, do the things that make them responsible citizens, or even responsible human beings, then I think we'll be fine, because you will want to recruit from those areas. As it is right now, I think what you tend to see is a limited amount of dollars going to a limited amount of programs to give them exactly what they need, because there is no broader recruiting pool. That's one of the things we talk about, especially, again, with language: the target population that government agencies can recruit from is extremely limited. What we really want to have is a much broader pool to recruit from.

And a Foreign Service Officer said, "You're working at creating people who are culturally and linguistically prepared to do the work that these various agencies need. . . . [W]e need people who are culturally and linguistically ready to work on the problems that America has out there." The respondents acknowledged that this could not be a one-time effort. As a senior executive from a major urban police department said, a large part of the recruiting challenge is "just keeping that stream going and continually projecting out to see" what the department's future needs will be.

Another challenge is ensuring equal opportunity for access to global education. One Foreign Service Officer said, "[W]e're trying to build up partnerships with not only universities and colleges, but also with organizations that have the same goal we do, which is to reach out to students at the collegiate level, both undergraduate and graduate, and encourage them to get involved in public service and international issues, and, with a particular focus on encouraging people from diverse backgrounds. The people who say, 'Gosh, I didn't know that would fit me.'" Another Foreign Service Officer agreed:

> I think the idea of universal opportunity is attractive to most Americans. I think that language learning, cross-cultural training, opportunities to be part of this brave new linguistic and cultural world should not be limited . . . . I think that's part of what it can do to sell itself, is this universality of opportunity, the idea that in *our* country we need everybody, everybody's help to succeed in these efforts, nobody's excluded. Just because your last name isn't some well known last name associated with international affairs, you can still, you know, as a complete unknown who's willing to work hard at mastering these things, make your contribution, and everybody in our country has the right and the obligation to make these kinds of contributions to this national effort. That's one of the reasons to make it a national strategy.

2.   Goal: Accurately Project What Language and Cultural Skills the Nation's Workforce Will Need in All Sectors on a Continuing Basis

The object of this goal is to ensure that the analytic capabilities of all sectors—government, the private sector, and civil society—are used effectively to project every sector's needs as realistically as possible, as far in advance as practical, and consistently over an extended period so as to maintain or improve the Nation's ability to protect its security and economic well being. Several respondents noted the need to project national needs for language and cultural skills well in advance of requirements because of the amount of time needed to provide an adequate education. An official familiar with language services supporting the FBI observed that when there's a need for language capacity, "the Director doesn't want to hear, 'Well, I'm sending somebody to school and we'll have him out in two years.' . . . I can't do that, and the American people wouldn't want to hear that either." A respondent from the Intelligence Community agreed, recalling that in one instance, "by the time the military produced a full pipeline to

develop brand-new . . . graduates" in a particular foreign language, "the conflict was essentially over. Because of the amount of time it took us to basically identify a need to stand up a program, get it into the [planning] cycle," and get authorization to spend funds on the needed training.

The planning cycle does not affect only government. The needs of the private sector and the workforce must also be addressed. A respondent from the private sector urged the importance of "promoting the idea of America's labor, the value we can bring around the globe." While industry for a number of years has been outsourcing positions to other countries, "we almost sort of say that in essence what we're trying to do is source, that American labor can bring values in other areas, that we want to bring jobs *to* America from other countries. . . . [P]oliticians are going to say, 'How hard is that to have happen?' But somehow you've got to find . . . folks that can help build on that idea."

Like the need to educate a large workforce, the need to project what languages and cultural skills will be in future demand is not a one-time effort. While most respondents agreed that future needs could be projected, they also recognized that today's needs might not be those of the future, and that it would be necessary to undertake an ongoing review. This is hardly surprising: the obligation to review needs and establish or adjust requirements is built into the intelligence cycle, the business cycle, the National Strategy for Homeland Security, and the QHSR. It is a necessary feature of any enterprise that exists in a changing environment; and the world in which we live is certainly that.

3.   **Issue: Education and Training Must Focus on Cultural Competence as Well as Language Skills**

Learning the basics of a language is not, by itself, sufficient to allow an individual to communicate clearly or competently. English is well known for borrowing phrases from other languages because the concepts expressed in those phrases are not expressed as easily, as concisely, or as precisely in English. Examples such as *au pair, bête noir, Ersatz, Fahrvergnügen, Schadenfreude, smörgåsbord, latte,* and *vendetta* may come to mind. An understanding of these words and phrases requires one to go beyond

112

vocabulary and to grasp concepts that are specific to another culture. Moreover, effective communication require a knowledge of when and how to speak. As one Foreign Service Officer observed, "You absolutely cannot just function with the verbs and nouns. That's not enough. You really have to have contextual knowledge in order to know how to apply them effectively. When to say certain things, when not to say certain things, how will you lead into a subject, every culture has its own intellectual traditions, its own things that are sad and funny. [T]here are very specific points of reference, points of departure, that you don't necessarily get from, you know, going through your book and memorizing phrases."

A respondent from the private sector agreed. This respondent suggested that curriculum should include education about different cultures, political systems, and business systems, as well as literature. Particularly in the public education system, "it gets very American-centric. . . . [I]f you sit back and look at curriculum today through the majority of high school, . . . the U.S.-based curriculum somewhat assumed that you grow up and you operate in the U.S. And what we're really trying to say here is, you grow up and you operate in the world."

Another Foreign Service Officer pointed out that the ability to *speak* is not necessarily the ability to *communicate*: "I think a lot of people who are not fluent in foreign languages think that fluency in a foreign language is in and of itself is indicative of maybe more than it is. Because someone can speak a foreign language and still be a blithering idiot. . . . I mean, they're not very effective and what they do, they don't really understand how to get across their point or advocate, they're actually not picking up all those things in the other language or with the other person that they're supposed to in order to be more effective."

A senior executive of a major urban police department agreed: "[O]ne of the things we do stress beyond knowing just the language is a cultural diversity class. If we're going into, let's say officers come to a house where . . . it's a Muslim family. Do we know to take shoes off at the door? That the father is the head of the household?

113

What the woman's role is? . . . [O]bviously it's important to know the various cultures." As noted previously, this is more than simple courtesy; it may be a matter of officer safety, or whether an investigation is successful.

An anthropologist familiar with Defense programs said that one approach to solving that particular problem may be to provide students with a conceptual framework for observing and understanding how communities or societies function. In teaching students to apply that framework, schools should also identify and teach the skills that allow individuals to work effectively in a cross-cultural environment. These include interpersonal communication skills, an appreciation for difference, adaptability, and similar traits.

A university professor agreed: "[T]he basic metric is to see whether people are capable of quickly putting themselves into the mind-frame and the position of others, that's really the basic thing that's going on . . . , and there are some simple sort of things that you can do [to teach this skill] even as an undergraduate teacher." A respondent from the Intelligence Community offered a similar view: "I would think what we're chasing is, you know, something . . . that says, 'Okay, you acknowledge that I have a different cultural viewpoint, you show understanding of that, and you accept it.' I think that's a passing grade right there, and I think that should kind of be that benchmark that we would be looking for." Clearly, however, these kinds of skills go well beyond language education, and will require thoughtful planning, as well as a significant investment of time and effort.

4.   Issue: Strategic Planning Must Embrace the Needs of the Private Sector and Civil Society as Well as Government

Several respondents recognized the importance of planning for the needs of the private sector. One university professor commented that improved global education should provide "a much broader and deeper group of people with significant cultural understanding that could be relied upon . . . to improve American standing in the world by improving" not only public and state diplomacy, but also day-to-day business activities. Likewise, a senior executive of a major multinational consulting firm agreed

that the ability to work in a multicultural environment was, "[a]t a minimum . . . very, very important to us in terms of individuals being able to recognize that they're dealing in different cultures, recognizing the aspects of globalization and actually the sheer size of the world." While the needs of nonprofit and other nongovernmental organizations were not specifically mentioned, it seems clear that such organizations have similar needs for similar reasons.

Like the other considerations discussed here, the concern for the private sector and civil society is grounded in practical reality. A respondent familiar with Defense programs described the problem in terms any manager in any sector would understand: "I am going to need this many speakers and listeners in these languages at such and such a time. How am I going to source those people? Where am I going to get them from? Hire them? Contract for them? What do we have in the national base that would provide these people? . . . [I]f you are relying on someone else, you have to negotiate with them for that partnership. This is all a lot of work." And the smaller the pool of qualified applicants, the more work it is.

The private sector and civil society must be fully engaged in the effort to create a larger skilled workforce because (a) their engagement and support will evoke or encourage the support of legislators, (b) the needs of the private sector and civil society are likely to provide an increasing proportion of employment opportunities in an increasingly globalized and interdependent economy, and (c) businesses and private donors or foundations can play a significant role in establishing educational institutions or determining the allocation of such institutions' resources.

The problem of resources is both critical and troublesome. Several respondents suggested that the private sector may offer part of the solution. An official familiar with international education programs of the U.S. Department of Education said that "the business community needs to put its money where its mouth is," and pay more than "lip service" to the desirability of a globally educated U.S. workforce. This respondent said that there are fewer international jobs that there are people interested in filling them. In this view, the private sector needs to ensure both that those with language skills and cultural competence have viable career paths, and that such opportunities are widely

known. In addition, the business community should not only influence schools and universities to offer effective global education, but should also lend them tangible financial support.

A respondent from the Intelligence Community agreed that the private sector needed to do more to make career opportunities both available and understood:

> We need industry to be standing up and saying, "We need people with these skills. We need people who can deal in the global market, we need people who are global citizens, we need people who understand culture." Because that's where change will tend to happen. . . . When industry makes demands, number one, government listens, and number two, academia listens. Because the second biggest funder of the academic system is industry. You know, they're coming and they're pumping all kinds of money in because these are the skill sets that they need. . . . [B]ut we also need industry to really kind of . . . make more of a public statement of the need or of the value so that people can see it. Because again, you know, you talk about parents who don't see what opportunities are there for their kids, you know, if IBM made it clear what kinds of opportunities were available, or if Apple made it clear what kinds of opportunities were available, you know, then they might be more inclined to want to jump in that direction.

A respondent from the private sector agreed that the business community had a role to play, both in terms of direct financial support and sponsorship of service or supporting programs. This respondent suggested that "certain large corporations," in particular, could provide contributions to schools or other educational programs, including early-age exposure to foreign languages and community service projects in developing countries (in high school, for example). Even smaller business organizations could help with or contribute to school- or community-sponsored fundraising events, and other efforts "to encourage certain programs in their communities"; and could provide funding or other support "to offset some of the expenses for schools that are maybe sponsoring programs like that."

The private endowment of faculty chairs, research centers, institutes in various disciplines, and schools is a practice of long standing. For example, Balliol College (Oxford University) was founded by John de Balliol in 1263, and its endowment later made permanent by his widow; Clare College (Cambridge University) was endowed by

Elizabeth de Clare in 1338. From the earliest days of this country, eponymous universities were established or strongly influenced by businessmen-turned-philanthropists such as Nicholas Brown, Jr., Andrew Carnegie, Ezra Cornell, Washington Duke, Johns Hopkins, Leland Stanford, Cornelius Vanderbilt, and Elihu Yale. The practice continues today. The respondent familiar with Defense programs noted, for example, that an award-winning Center for International Studies was established in 1991 at South High School in Shawnee Mission, Kansas, offering classes in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, and associated courses in international business, law, geopolitics, etc.[157] Why Shawnee Mission? "Because the businessmen in that area had international connections. It was informed businessmen."

5.   Issue: A National Strategy Should Accommodate Existing and Effective Institutions to the Extent Possible

Several respondents noted that there already exist institutions and program that either deliver some form of effective global education or provide funding for effective education programs. Examples specifically mentioned included the Fulbright Program, the National Security Education Program, and the National Science Foundation, among others. None of the respondents believed it would be useful or politically advisable to interfere substantially with existing and effective institutions and programs. Rather, those respondents who addressed existing institutions suggested that a national strategy for global education be designed to improve and take advantage of the existing strengths of those institutions, and work toward better coordination of their programs.

A Foreign Service Officer was emphatic on this point, both because of the intrinsic value of the effective institutions and because of their familiarity to the public:

> Well, I think the first thing you don't do is, you don't throw the baby out with the bath water. I think you look at [the existing institutions] closely, you try to determine, I'd say, what's worked well and what hasn't worked well, if there were obstacles, bureaucratic or otherwise, and then I think the things that worked, I would . . . attempt to expand or build on them, since they're known. And I think that's an important element, they're

---

[157] *See generally* the website of the Shawnee Mission School District, Center for International Studies, at http://www.smsd.org/custom/smsouth/CISWEBSITE/index.html (accessed October 26, 2011).

117

known to kids of a certain age as educational possibilities. Hopefully they're known to a certain number of parents, certain number of educators, all of whom you want on your side. So the idea of having a new and improved Boren or . . . building on something that's worked well, I think, is better than, as so often happens when there's a new Administration that comes in and they just give it another name and, you know, or try to erase something that somebody else did that was successful. . . . I think that's always a huge mistake because it makes everything seem un-serious and transitory, and in fact you, one of the points of doing this is . . . to further convince people of its importance. So you want to build on what you've done.

A respondent familiar with Defense programs generally agreed. This respondent felt it would be a mistake to merge existing institutions and programs. It would be better instead to establish a national council, get representatives of existing and effective programs together at a senior, operational level, and do the planning necessary to achieve the overall goal of improving global education.

A university professor took a slightly different position. In this respondent's view, effective institutions and their independence would be preserved; but particularly on the federal level, would be subject to a broader range of inputs at the strategic level:

I guess I think a centralized policy would be useful. . . . But I'm not sure that too much tinkering, you know, I don't want NSF, for example, which would be one of the places that would have to change, I don't want NSF to be anything, any less autonomous than it is now. But I think that they should be subject to lots of people noodging them and telling them, "This is what, if you really want to think about the knowledge that is needed for the United States of America, and you really want to think about what your goal as an institution is, you've got to be thinking about this."

Likewise, this respondent suggested that the Fulbright Program might be enhanced, but not fundamentally altered. As noted previously, this respondent also suggested the creation of a federal office to oversee the work of the cross-sector committee setting strategic goals and developing a legislative agenda to implement them; and that this office would have the "right to poke its nose into everything inside the U.S. government and to make suggestions backed by this strong group of people in Congress and the President."

118

Interestingly, it was this academic who appeared to take the most directive approach toward reforming global education in the U.S.. One might speculate that this was because many of the other respondents had survived a number of political and bureaucratic battles in Washington and were more sensitive to the possibilities of resistance to change or the risks of becoming a lightning rod for opposition. In the absence of data, however, I suggest that this interesting but collateral question might be reserved for future inquiry.

6. Issue: A National Strategy May Be Obliged to Create Visible, Tangible Incentives for Participation in Global Education Programs

As discussed above,[158] a national strategy is unlikely to succeed without widespread public and political support. One Foreign Service Officer addressed the means for securing political support: "I think your priority list has to be linked to those specific goals that the funders will respond to. . . . [Y]ou definitely have to have the security, the economic . . . , or it's abstract for most people. So if you don't link it to make us as a nation safer, if you don't link it to being able to bring prosperity to our country, then people aren't going to see it as something that's very important. And 'people,' I mean the people who can fund [i.e., appropriators] . . . ." But many respondents felt that simply making global education programs available would not be sufficient to secure the desired level of public participation, at least at the outset. Consequently, a number of respondents suggested a variety of incentives that might be offered to encourage the improvement of, and greater participation in, global education.

Some of the respondents suggested direct incentives to encourage participation in global education programs. Typically, these suggestions tended to take effect at secondary or higher educational levels. For example, a psychology professor suggested that preference in college admissions be given to students with previous global education, or even that at least some level of language study be required for admission. A Foreign Service Officer suggested that funding might be made available to provide international internships to undergraduates pursuing global education. A respondent from the private

---

[158] *See* discussion in Chapter IV.A.1.

sector suggested that students with some degree of global education programs might receive preferential rates on student loans for college and university studies; that families of such students establish tax-advantaged savings accounts to pay for their studies;[159] or that such families might receive tax credits or similar relief for investment in global education.

Once students are engaged in global education, other incentives may help keep them there. A professor of psychology suggested a system of positive reinforcements or rewards for students (or their families) based on meeting performance goals at each stage of the process (defined age-wise as preschool, elementary school, middle school, high school, and through the first degree). Recognizing that some rewards would be understood better by the parents of young children than by the students themselves, this respondent nonetheless noted that even kindergarteners are very competitive, and argued that it would be fruitful to "[c]larify the reward system at every level."

Several respondents suggested incentives based on successful completion of a course of global education. Some respondents suggested—or said that their agencies had already implemented—preferences in hiring for persons with certain desired language skills. Respondents from the Foreign Commercial Service and the law enforcement community spoke of the need to maintain a surge capacity, or a national readiness program, that could help meet needs for language skills and cultural competencies on short notice. One of these respondents suggested that such a program might provide tuition assistance for the study of designated languages, with progressively greater payments for increasingly good performance (grades). Similar payments would be made to those who maintain a degree of proficiency in their designated languages. The other respondents noted that their organizations already provide incentive pay or a salary supplement to employees who maintain proficiency in certain languages.

---

[159] Such accounts might be similar to the qualified tuition programs established under Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 529.

As an example, the Department of Defense has identified "foreign language and regional proficiency as a mission critical skill,"[160] and has established a process for identifying and publishing a list of "strategic languages"[161] and paying a bonus of up to $1,000 per month to servicemembers who maintain a specified degree of proficiency in one or more duty-related languages of the highest interest.[162] While the Defense Department generally is not directly involved in homeland security efforts (as opposed to national security efforts), its Foreign Language Proficiency Bonus program may serve as a precedent and an example for similar programs related to homeland security.

As noted previously, still other respondents suggested that job opportunities for persons with such skills should be better publicized. Finally, one respondent suggested that language and cultural skills could be tied to enhanced promotion potential, particularly early in the graduate's career.

C.   OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the goals and general considerations outlined above, several respondents suggested other principles that fell somewhere in the grey area between goals and methods. For example, the principle that language training should begin as early as possible can be viewed both as a teaching modality and as an ultimate goal of a national strategy, intended to take advantage of the fact that language as a rule is more easily and thoroughly learned when the student is quite young. These additional considerations were:

---

[160] U.S. Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel & Readiness, *Management of DoD Language and Regional Proficiency Capabilities,* Department of Defense Instruction 5160.70, ¶ 1.3 (June 12, 2007), http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/516070p.pdf , U.S. Department of Defense (accessed October 31, 2011).

[161] U.S. Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel & Readiness, *Foreign Language Proficiency Bonus,* Department of Defense Instruction 7280.03, ¶ 1.3 (August 20, 2007), http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/728003p.pdf , U.S. Department of Defense (accessed October 31, 2011).

[162] Ibid.*,* §§ 6.1, 6.5 & Table T1. It is not clear that the Department provides similar incentives for regional proficiency, but instead defines it in part by reference to language skill. *See* DoD Instruction 5160.70, Enclosure 3 (Regional Proficiency Skill Level Guidelines).

1.   Language Training Should Begin as Early as Practical

An anthropologist said that that the earlier one starts learning a language, the more effectively one can learn that language and the easier it is to learn other languages later in life. This respondent observed that language education in the U.S. generally doesn't begin until high school or junior high school, which is a mistake. In this view, foreign language should be taught as early as possible, ideally in bilingual preschools and elementary schools. A professor of psychology agreed, noting that there is a body of research tending to show that when a group of children raised speaking one language is matched against a group of multilingual children on intelligence or performance tests, "the multilingual group will outperform the other on every measure." Another university professor said, "[T]here's some evidence that you can [learn language] much better than we used to think at later ages"; but this respondent observed that "in an awful lot of school districts around the country, . . . if learning a second language were offered from Grade 1 onward, . . . parents would likely be pleased."[163]

Other respondents also agreed, because of the lead time required to acquire and maintain a useful level of language skill and cultural competence. Respondents from both local and federal law enforcement agencies expressed reluctance to take serving officers or agents off the streets and send them to language training for extended periods of time, and concern for the fiscal and opportunity costs of the diverted manpower. The respondent from local law enforcement urged that it would be much more efficient to hire candidates who already possessed desirable language and cultural skills. A respondent from the Intelligence Community said that the ability to work with languages and cultures at a sophisticated level requires 15 to 20 years of education and experience. Moreover, one has to work to maintain the requisite skills: "I also think another thing that we underestimate, or we don't pay enough attention to, is the amount of contact-hours you really have to have with a foreign language. It's not a matter of I learn it and I

---

[163] The latter respondent noted a potential obstacle, for which no solution was obvious: when children are learning languages unfamiliar to their parents, the parents "would feel, just like they had trouble with, like the New Math, they would have trouble with the idea that they can't help their children [with their schoolwork], which is an issue." On balance, however, this respondent felt that the perceived benefits of language and cultural education outweigh this concern.

own it for the rest of my life. It's not riding a bike, okay? You fall off the language bike, it takes a lot to get back on. And it's not a straight-line gain in capabilities, you know? But it is a pretty straight-line drop when you stop working at it."

> **2.   Education in a Foreign Language and Culture Should Include Direct Exposure to That Language and Culture in Their Native Environment**

A few respondents said that an education program in language and cultural skills should include a period of study or service abroad—that is, some direct exposure to the language or culture in its native environment. A university professor said that funding educational institutions "to send people abroad to do work, to do internships, or to be involved in cultural immersion, that stuff actually does seem to be effective, there does seem to be some evidence of that." In fact, this respondent suggested, such programs may be more cost-effective than funding undergraduate colleges to offer more language courses on campus. Similarly, a respondent from the private sector suggested that the business community already supports service-oriented programs that serve the dual purposes of "getting kids exposed to different parts of the world" and rendering (at least nominally) a public service such as "building houses or helping locals do something with the schools." Such programs might well be expanded, particularly if there are economic benefits to the sponsors (through tax benefits, increased business, etc.).

Such programs may well be impractical for children in primary schools. By the time students are in secondary schools, however, the private-sector respondent noted that such programs are increasingly available—although the cost will vary according to the distance between the sponsoring community and the service locale. At the undergraduate level, there are assorted, structured study-abroad programs such as those offered by many colleges and universities[164] and the Council on International Educational Exchange,[165]

---

[164] *See, e.g.,* Center for International Studies, Grinnell College, "Off-Campus Study," http://www.grinnell.edu/offices/ocs (accessed October 26, 2011).

[165] *See generally* CIEE's website at http://www.ciee.org/study-abroad/programs/ (accessed October 26, 2011).

and even self-directed research programs such as InterFuture.[166] At the graduate level, of course, foreign study is not at all unusual, and may be externally funded by various grants, fellowships, etc. Whether or not there is well documented scholarly evidence to support the educational value of such programs at the high school and undergraduate levels, I suspect that almost anyone who has spent an extended period abroad will agree anecdotally that living in a foreign community facilitates both acquisition of its language and a practical understanding of its culture.

As a related matter, several respondents expressed approval in principle of a requirement that students who receive public benefits or incentives for participation in a global education program (see the discussion in section 8, below) should perform some period of national or public service with an approved agency or nongovernmental organization. There were some variations on this theme.

One respondent suggested that in exchange for tuition benefits, students would be expected to perform a period of service as global educators, translators, or some other function—perhaps in an underserved part of the nation—requiring language or cultural skills. Further, in exchange for a periodic stipend, the student would commit to maintaining a specified level of competence and to return to service for a limited period in time of need. A respondent in the private sector suggested that the service requirement might be extended to embrace service not only to the government directly, but also to contractors performing services on behalf of the government. In principle, this would have the advantage of providing service to the government, well prepared staff for the contractor, and an opportunity for the graduate to make connections both to the government and to the private sector while gaining practical experience in the application of his or her language and cultural skills.

Finally, a professor of international relations suggested that the service requirement might be further extended to include American NGOs performing relief services abroad. Examples of acceptable organizations included Save the Children and Catholic Relief Services. A Foreign Service Officer agreed. Both of these respondents

---

[166] *See generally* InterFuture's website at http://www.interfuture.org/web/index.html (accessed October 26, 2011).

also felt that service with NGOs not based in the U.S. (such as Oxfam or *Médecins sans frontières*) would be equally meritorious, but that securing approval for such service would be politically much more difficult, in part because it would involve U.S. funding for a non-U.S. organization, and in part because the benefits to the United States would be attenuated by the lack of a direct connection to a U.S. organization.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VI.   CONCLUSION

Whether it is described as an insufficiency of educated citizens, a significant demand, or a misalignment of resources, the Nation has a problem to address: important jobs are not being well done because skilled workers are not being dedicated to the problem. The skills in question are the abilities to speak foreign languages and to adapt to foreign cultures; the object is to facilitate counterintelligence, border protection, law enforcement, international trade, and other endeavors critical to homeland security.

There is a great deal of evidence that Americans have not learned these skills in sufficient numbers to meet the Nation's needs. The respondents indicated that the principal reasons are a lack of a comprehensive strategy and inadequate funding,[167] and their conclusions are supported by the sole rigorous and comprehensive study of the question. In addition, several respondents suggested that there is a public demand for global education that will require some reform in the focus of language and culture studies at the university level, and that the necessary change is meeting some resistance from faculty who pursue more traditional instructional methods. These respondents believe that university leaders can be enlisted to facilitate the necessary change if government and the private sector can provide support.

Most respondents thought that a national strategy, properly crafted and executed, could help address these needs. Based on interviews with the respondents, I concluded that the model most likely to be successful was not a centralized decision-making process, but one in which the authority to make decisions and the resources to support them were widely distributed, because of the diversity of stakeholders and the divergence of their interests. The National Strategy for Homeland Security, which explicitly

---

[167] A review of the literature originally suggested that cultural politics and the lack of unified management of education programs were also contributing factors, *see* Chapter I.C.3, above. Interviews with the respondents suggested that an attempt to impose unified management on the Nation's education programs would be both unsuccessful and a bad idea. Contrary to the literature, the respondents also indicated that partisan politics did not generally present a significant impediment to global education in the U.S. rather, they felt that the biggest political problem would be demonstrating to the constituents of a global education strategy that they would derive tangible benefits from supporting it.

recognizes that some 85% of the Nation's critical infrastructure and key resources are privately owned, is an example of such a strategy. The model is described in detail in the literature discussing "megacommunities."

Most respondents believed that before the Nation was willing to devote the effort and resources to developing and implementing a national strategy, some leadership of national stature would be needed to educate the public and other stakeholders about the importance of global education and the economic and security benefits to be derived from improving global education in the United States. For that purpose, leaders would ideally be recruited from government, the private sector, and civil society; it is entirely possible that the impetus for this effort would have to come from the private sector. Once a more favorable political climate was established, various stakeholders could be engaged to develop a more concrete approach to the problem.

Due to sample size and possible respondent bias, this study cannot claim to present definitive answers to the questions it asked. The interviews do, however, offer with some consistency a number of ideas that help frame an apparently workable solution to a well documented problem. While one might ordinarily suggest that additional research would be productive, the increasing globalization of the economy—and, in particular, the Nation's increasing reliance on foreign trade and investment, as well as political and military alliances—argues that the United States no longer enjoys an unlimited amount of time to study the problem and contemplate its options.

From interviews with the respondents I extrapolated the following vision statement for a national strategy for global education:

> The United States will work with partners at all levels of government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and individuals, to ensure that its citizens acquire the language skills and cultural competence needed to engage with other countries in pursuit of the security and prosperity of the Nation.

In support of that broad vision, the respondents offered the following goals for a national strategy:

1. Ensure that all students in the U.S. educational system have the opportunity to receive an education that permits them to acquire the skills needed to meet the Nation's needs.

2. Accurately project what language and cultural skills the Nation's workforce will need in all sectors on a continuing basis.

Further, the respondents offered several considerations in connection with how these goals might be achieved:

3. Education and training must focus not only on language skills, but on cultural competence as well.

4. In projecting future needs for language and cultural skills, analysts must bear in mind both the needs of government and those of the private sector, including those who constitute the U.S. workforce.

5. There are some existing federal institutions that function effectively to provide global education or cross-cultural research. A national strategy should interfere as little as possible with those institutions.

6. In order to ensure that Americans understand the benefits, and take advantage, of improved global education programs, there may need to be some visible, tangible benefits to provide incentives for participation in language and cultural education.

In addition, the respondents raised two important practical considerations that fell somewhere between goals and methods:

7. Language training should begin as early as practical because (a) the acquisition of new language and related skills takes time, (b) children generally find it easier to learn languages than adults, and (c) people who have learned more than one language generally find it easier to acquire additional languages than those who have not.

8. Ideally, education in a foreign language and culture will include direct exposure to that language and culture in its native environment.

Finally, there were two critical conditions for the success of a national strategy. First, as noted above, the goals cannot be determined solely by the federal government, even taking into consideration the interest of other stakeholders. The authority to decide

what languages and cultures will be taught, and how, must be devolved to other interested parties, in much the same way that private industry under the National Infrastructure Protection Plan is expected to perform its own risk assessments and take appropriate protective measures in consultation with its partners in business, civil society, and all levels of government. Second, the difficult decision must be made to allocate resources to building a national capacity for global education. The U.S. failed for many years to devote adequate resources to maintaining its physical infrastructure,[168] and is now paying an increased cost as transportation,[169] manufacturing,[170] and energy systems,[171] for example, become increasingly obsolescent, stressed, and prone to costly failures or inability to compete with newer structures and technologies.[172] The U.S. is already at a relative disadvantage to other countries in the field of global education. The longer we wait to improve our global education programs, the more urgent the need will become, the longer it will take us to catch up, and the more it will cost.

America needs to improve its approach to global education. Both the respondents and the sparse scholarly literature argue that one of the significant impediments to improvement is the lack of a strategic plan, or even a coherent framework for planning. At the same time, it is clear that the number of stakeholders, the diversity of stakeholder

---

[168] *See generally* Stephen Flynn, *The Edge of Disaster* (New York: Random House, 2007), 3–4, 68–91.

[169] *See generally* Economic Development Research Group, Inc., *Failure to Act: The Economic Impact of Current Investment Trends in Surface Transportation Infrastructure,* American Society of Civil Engineers, 2011, http://www.asce.org/uploadedFiles/Infrastructure/Report_Card/ASCE-FailureToActFinal.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011). For a particularized discussion of the state of U.S. highway bridges, *see* Stephen Lee Davis, Kevin DeGood, Nick Donohue, and David Goldberg, *The Fix We're In For: The State of our Nation's Busiest Bridges,* Transportation for America, October 2011, http://t4america.org/docs/bridgereport/bridgereport-metros.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011).

[170] S. Jack Hu, Don Chaffin, and Yoram Koren, *Re-Shaping U.S. Manufacturing for Global Competitiveness: A workshop report submitted to the National Science Foundation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2010), 8–10, http://www.engin.umich.edu/eiome/Workshop_Report_Draft.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011).

[171] *See generally* National Energy Policy Development Group, *National Energy Policy: Reliable, Affordable, and Environmentally Sound Energy for America's Future* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2001), 7–1 to 7–18.

[172] Despite well publicized infrastructure failures such as periodic regional blackouts and brownouts, and the occasional catastrophic bridge collapse, some editorialists continue to question the need for increased spending on maintaining or improving the infrastructure. *See, e.g.,* Charles Lane, "The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination," *Washington Post,* October 31, 2011.

interests, and the relative independence of education authorities from federal control dictate that the process of planning and implementing a strategy be very broadly based. These preliminary notes on a national strategy for global education are offered as one basis for a nationwide dialogue on how to achieve the improvements that the Nation needs to maintain its leadership position in the world in the 21st century.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX.   SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW OUTLINE

Introduction

Self, NPS/CHDS, study topic
Request permission to record

Interviewee

Describe current connection with or concern for global education (if any).
Prior connections? Involvement in NGOs, nonprofits, academic programs?

Shortage of People to Do Homeland Defense & Security Functions

Have you observed this in your own work?
(If yes) What are the manifestations?
(If no) Are you aware of problems in other agencies or in the private sector?
(If appropriate) What do you think are the causes?

Supporting Documentation:

Aug 2007: GAO says Foreign Service is lacking people with critical language
skills. Problems with visa fraud, econ negotiations, public diplomacy.

Apr 2007: Pew Research survey: Americans' knowledge of current affairs
has not generally expanded over the period 1989 to 2007.

2006: Committee for Econ. Development says U.S. students lack language
skills and cultural competencies

2005: Foreign Service DG says 60% of critical language speakers are eligible
to retire within 5 years.

2003: Dept. of Ed. cohort study shows that during the period 1988 – 2000,
only 10% of U.S. college grads met the most generous criteria for global
preparedness.

Jan 2002: GAO says Army, State, FCS, FBI, and NSA lack language skills.
Problems with military, law enforcement, intelligence, counterterrorism, and
diplomatic efforts.

Existing Federal Programs and Obstacles to Their Success

For which federal educational programs (if any) do you have responsibility in your job?

Which programs (if any) affect your job/feed job candidates to your agency or area/etc.?

Are they meeting your agency's needs? Its expectations or hopes?

Could they do better?
(If yes) How?
(If no) What do you think are the causes?

> *Prompts:*   Do you see the lack of a centralized policy and/or management as an issue? Why / why not?
> What about the express connection between education and defense and security agencies? (Source: David MacMichael, former CIA senior estimates officer and editor of *Unclassified,* the publication of the Ass'n of Nat'l Security Alumni, during Cong'l debates on the Nat'l Security Education Act of 1991.)
> What about political controversy? (From the right: left-leaning professorial agenda, lack of balance/fairness, comparative religion. From the left: advancing a right-leaning national security agenda, restrictions on academic freedom, turning the academy into the handmaiden of government. Debate within the professions, e.g., anthropology.)
> What about insufficient funding? (Compare Sen. John Glenn, 1991, *we don't want to take scarce resources away from intel agencies in favor of ed progs of uncertain benefit,* with Adelman, 1981, and Scott, 2005, *funding is inadequate and falling in real terms to the detriment of important ed progs*.)
> Adequate link between "soft" studies (languages, area studies) and paths to success in American society (status, earnings, power)?
> Other impediments?

Would a national strategy contribute anything to the resolution of these problems?
(If yes) What? How?
(If no) Why not?

Goals of a National Strategy

If we were going to start today to build a program of global education to meet the Nation's needs, how would we decide what goals would we want to achieve?

> *Prompts:*　　What are the relevant considerations?
> How do we prioritize the goals?
> Do we *limit* ourselves to "critical" areas of study? (Pro: limited resources. Con: intellectual freedom, difficulty in forecasting.) Do we *focus* on those areas?
> How do we determine which areas will be critical in out-years (5 or 10)? Which languages?
> Do we tie program support to participation or service in civil, foreign, military, or intelligence service?

Who would participate in the process?

In your view, what goals *would* we want to achieve?

Suppose, instead, that we're going to build on the existing structure. Are the goals any different?
(If yes) In what ways? What are the new goals?

How do we work with what's there, and what do we add or subtract, to achieve the national goals?

> *Prompts:*　　Central policy/management/strategy?
> Tie between academy and defense/security establishment?
> How to defuse political controversies?
> How to ameliorate funding issues?

Methods for Achieving the Goals of a National Strategy
(*Note:* Not all of these questions may be answerable by all interviewees).

For each of the goals identified in discussion:

In your view, what is the best approach to getting the necessary educational process authorized? Funded (appropriations)?

Who needs to be part of that process?

What is the best method for delivering the education needed to achieve the goal?

At what grade levels should this be commenced, and for how long should it be continued?

For each of the impediments to meeting the national need identified in discussion:

What is the best way to overcome/defuse/address this problem?
Who needs to be part of that process?

Closing Questions & Comments

Are there any significant issues or concerns that I've failed to ask you about?
Is there anything else about your views, or your agency's, that I ought to know?

Who else should I talk to about this study? Would you be willing to make an introduction/let me use you as a point of reference?

Are there other documents or publications I should review for more insight on this issue? Can you point me in the right direction to find them?

Profuse thanks for your time and willingness to participate/speak with me.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adelman, Kenneth L. "Speaking of America: Public Diplomacy in Our Time," *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 925–927.

American Anthropological Association, Executive Board. "Statement on the Human Terrain System Project" (October 20, 2007), American Anthropological Association, http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-HTS.cfm.

Baker, David, Hate Crimes Coordinator, Community Relations Division, Montgomery County (MD) Police Department. *On Common Ground: Sikh American Cultural Awareness for Law Enforcement* (Washington: U.S. Dept. of Justice, 2007). Available on line at http://www.justice.gov/crs/video/ocg-video.htm.

Beaton, Sarah T. "The Federal Role in International Business Education," *Thunderbird International Business Review* 43, no. 2 (March–April 2001): 289–302.

Bennett, Stephen Earl, et al. "Citizens' Knowledge of Foreign Affairs," *Harvard Journal of Press/Politics* 1, no. 2 (1996): 10.

Bollag, Burton. "A Failure to Communicate." *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 27, 2007, A24.

Committee for Economic Development, Research & Policy Committee. *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security* (Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 2006), 8–10.

Crawford, Elizabeth. "Area-Studies Programs Come Under Fire," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 4, 2003, A19.

Curran, James, et al. "Media System, Public Knowledge and Democracy: A Comparative Study," *European Journal of Communication* 24, no. 1 (2009): 5.

Davis, Stephen Lee, Kevin DeGood, Nick Donohue, and David Goldberg. "The Fix We're in For: The State of our National's Busiest Bridges," October 2011. Transportation for America, http://t4america.org/docs/bridgereport/bridgereport-metros.pdf.

Economic Development Research Group, Inc. "Failure to Act: The Economic Impact of Current Investment Trends in Surface Transportation Infrastructure," 2011. American Society of Civil Engineers, http://www.asce.org/uploadedFiles/Infrastructure/Report_Card/ASCE-FailureToActFinal.pdf.

Fischer, Karin. "Study Abroad's New Focus Is Job Skills: colleges strive to translate students' experience for employers," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 20, 2010, A1.

Flynn, Stephen. *The Edge of Disaster.* New York: Random House, 2007.

Gerencser, Mark, Christopher Kelly, Fernando Napolitano, and Reginald Van Lee. *Megacommunities: How Leaders of Government, Business and Non-Profits Can Tackle Today's Global Challenges Together.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

"Grief Spans Sea as Gun Ends a Life Mistakenly." *New York Times,* October 21, 1992. Available on line at http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9E0CEFDD163BF932A15753C1A964958260.

Hitt, Jack. "Say No More," *New York Times Magazine,* February 29, 2004.

Hu, S. Jack, Don Chaffin, and Yoram Koren. "Re-Shaping U.S. Manufacturing for Global Competitiveness: A workshop report submitted to the National Science Foundation," 2010. University of Michigan, http://www.engin.umich.edu/eiome/Workshop_Report_Draft.pdf.

Hunter, William D. "Got Global Competency?" *International Educator* 13, no. 2 (Spring 2004), 6–9.

Jacobson, Jennifer. "The Clash Over Middle East Studies," *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 6, 2004, A8.

Kazanjian, Miriam A. "Renewal of HEA–Title VI: a Mixed Picture," *International Educator* 13, no. 1 (Winter 2004): 44.

Kramer, Richard E., Director, Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service. Letter to Candidates for Foreign Service, October 4, 2008. U.S. Department of State, http://careers.state.gov/docs/3.0_Oral_Assessment.pdf.

Krasno, Jean. "US Colleges and Universities are Not Meeting Student Demands," *International Relations Curricum Challenges.* New Haven: Academic Council on the United Nations System, 2002.

Lane, Charles. "The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination," *The Washington Post,* October 31, 2011.

Legters, Lyman H. "International Studies: Fresh Support or Kiss of Death?" *International Studies* 24, no. 5 (September 1992): 50.

Lewis, Anne C. "Language Learning and National Security," *Phi Delta Kappan,* October 2007, 84–85.

Lockman, Zachary. "Critique from the right: The Neo-conservative Assault on Middle East Studies," *CR: the New Centennial Review* 5, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 75.

MacMichael, David. "Spooks on Campus," *The Nation,* June 8, 1992, 780.

Martens, China. "IBM targets Russian developers: Big Blue focusing on emerging markets with initiative aimed at attracting Russian developers," *InfoWorld,* February 3, 2006. Available on line at http://www.inforworld.com/d/developer-world/ibm-targets-russian-developers-507.

McFate, Montgomery. Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious Relationship," *Military Review* 85, no. 2 (March–April 2005), 24.

———. "The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture," *Joint Forces Quarterly,* no. 38 (2005), 42–48.

NAFSA. Association of International Educators and Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange. "An International Education Policy for U.S. Leadership, Competitiveness, and Security," October 2007. NAFSA, http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/united_states_international.

National Energy Policy Development Group. *National Energy Policy: Reliable, Affordable, and Environmentally Sound Energy for America's Future.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 2001.

National Research Council, Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs. *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future,* Mary Ellen O'Connell and Janet L. Norwood, eds. Washington: The National Academies Press, 2007.

Nelles, Wayne. "American Public Diplomacy as Pseudo-Education: A Problematic National Security and Counter-Terrorism Instrument," *International Politics* 2004, no. 41: 65–93.

Network of Concerned Anthropologists. "Pledge of Non-participation in Counterinsurgency," http://concerned.anthropologists.googlepages.com/home

Padgett, Deborah K. *Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research: Challenges and Rewards.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Partnership for Public Service, *Foreign Language Skills,* Issue Brief No. PPS-06-02 (Washington: Partnership for Public Service, 2006).

Paxman, Andrew. "Selling in a Second Language: Literal Translations Can Sabotage Marketing Campaigns," *Business Mexico* 3, no. 6 (June 1993): 36.

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. "What Americans Know: 1989–2007 – Public Knowledge of Current Affairs Little Changed by News and Information Revolutions," Pew Research Center, http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/319.pdf.

Ricks, David A. *Blunders in International Business,* 4th ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Rohde, David. "Army Enlists Anthropology in War Zones," *New York Times,* October 5, 2007, national edition.

Scott, Robert A. "Many Calls, Little Action: Global Illiteracy in the United States," *The Presidency* 8, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 19.

Shaver, Peter A. "Language Action Update: Notes from the Military Language Conference, Foreign Language and Culture: Force Multipliers, 8 to 9 November 2005," *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin* 31, no. 3 (July–Sept. 2005): 59–61.

Swift, Jonathan S. "Foreign Language Ability and International Marketing," *European Journal of Marketing* 25, no. 12 (1991), 36.

Tye, Kenneth A. "Global Education as a Worldwide Movement," *Phi Delta Kappan* 85, no. 2 (October 2003), 165.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and the Workforce. *International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003,* 108th Cong., 1st Sess., 2003, H.R. Rep. 308.

———. House. Committee on the Judiciary. *Recent Inspector General Reports Concerning the FBI: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security,* 111th Cong., 2d Sess., February 24, 2010, Serial No. 111-102, http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/111th/111-102_55067.PDF.

———. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948,* 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1948, S. Rep. 811, *reprinted in* 1948 U.S. Code, Cong'l & Admin. News 1011, 1012.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2011.

U.S. Department of Defense. National Security Education Program. The Language Flagship, "K–12 Programs," National Security Education Program, http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=48&Itemid=84.

———. The Language Flagship, "The Language Flagship: Changing the Paradigm of Language Education in the U.S," April 2008, National Security Education Program, Department of Defense, http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/The_Language_Flagship_Report_August_2008.pdf.

———. The Language Flagship, "The Language Flagship: Changing the Way Americans Learn Languages," July 2011, National Security Education Program, Department of Defense, http://www.thelanguageflagship.org/downloads/2010_Flagship_Annual_Report.pdf .

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *National Response Framework.* Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2008, http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf.

———. *National Infrastructure Protection Plan.* Washington: Dept. of Homeland Security, 2009, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/NIPP_Plan.pdf.

U.S. Department. of Homeland Security. *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland.* Washington: U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security, February 2010, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf.

———. Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. *Introduction to Arab American and Muslim American Cultures for DHS Personnel,* DVD. Washington: Department. of Homeland Security, 2006.

U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. *The First Three to Five Seconds,* streaming video. Dept. of Justice, 2005, http://www.justice.gov/crs/training_video/3to5_300k/Intro.htm.

———. *On Common Ground: Sikh American Cultural Awareness for Law Enforcement,* streaming video. Dept. of Justice, 2007, http://www.justice.gov/crs/video/ocg-video.htm.

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Office of Inspector General. *The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Foreign Language Translation Program,* Audit Report No. 10-02, October 2009, http://www.justice.gov/oig/reports/FBI/a1002_redacted.pdf.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs. "Passport Statistics," U.S. Department of State, http://www.travel.state.gov/passport/ppi/stats/stats_890.html.

U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Human Resources. "Guide to the Foreign Service Officer Selection Process." U.S. Department of State, 2010, http://careers.state.gov/uploads/c3/aa/c3aaf51ecdde77b983c7d763bc7d20b0/3-0_FSO_RegGuide.pdf.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls,* No. GAO-02-375 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 2002) ("Foreign Languages I").

———. *Results-Oriented Government: Practices That Can Help Enhance and Sustain Collaboration among Federal Agencies,* No. GAO-06-15 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2006).

———. *Department of State: Staffing and Foreign Language Shortfalls Persist Despite Initiatives to Address Gaps,* No. GAO-06-894 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2006).

———. *Defense Management: Preliminary Observations on DOD's Language and Cultural Awareness Capabilities,* No. GAO-09-176R (Washington, DC: Government Accountability Office, 2008), http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09176r.pdf (accessed October 27, 2011).

———. *Military Training: DOD Needs a Strategic Plan and Better Inventory and Requirements Data to Guide Development of Language Skills and Regional Proficiency,* No. GAO-09-568 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2009)

———. *Department of State: Comprehensive Plan Needed to Address Persistent Foreign Language Shortfalls,* No. GAO-09-955 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2009).

———. *Language Access: Selected Agencies Can Improve Services to Limited English Proficient Persons,* No. GAO-10-91 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2010).

———. *Department of Homeland Security: DHS Needs to Comprehensively Assess Its Foreign Language Needs and Capabilities and Identify Shortfalls,* No. GAO-10-714 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2010).

———. *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review: Enhanced Stakeholder Consultation and Use of Risk Information Could Strengthen Future Reviews,* No. GAO-11-873 (Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 2011).

U.S. Homeland Security Council. *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (Washington: Executive Office of the President, October 2007), http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf .

U.S. Office of Personnel Management. *An Analysis of Federal Employee Retirement Data: Predicting Future Retirements and Examining Factors Relevant to Retiring from Federal Service* (Washington: Office of Personnel Management, 2008), http://www.opm.gov/feddata/RetirementPaperFinal_v4.pdf .

Usunier, Jean-Claude, and Julie Anne Lee, *Marketing Across Cultures,* 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Education, 2009).

Washington, Tony. "UNCF Chief Makes Case for National Policy on International Education," *Black Issues in Higher Education* 19, no. 10 (July 4, 2002): 12.

Wilberschied, Lee. "Foreign Language Assistance Program At Risk," Washington Report: Language News from the Nation's Capital. *Foreign Language Annals* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 160.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1.   Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, VA

2.   Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA

3.   Donna Bivona, Assistant Chief Counsel
Transportation Security Administration
Arlington, VA

4.   Thomas Cellucci, Acting Director of
Research and Development Partnerships
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC

5.   Ivan Fong, General Counsel
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC

6.   Mark Gerencser, Member, National Security Education Board
and Executive Vice President, Booz Allen Hamilton
McLean, VA

7.   Charles Higginbotham, Staff Liaison
Education and Training Committee
International Association of Chiefs of Police
Alexandria, VA

8.   Francine J. Kerner, Chief Counsel
Transportation Security Administration
Arlington, VA

9.   Jean Krasno, Director
Multilateralism and International Organization Initiative
Colin Powell Center for Policy Studies
City College of New York
New York, NY

10.   Andre Lewis, Deputy Assistant Secretary for
       International Foreign Language Education
       Office of Post-Secondary Education
       U.S. Department of Education
       Washington, DC

11.   Mark Logan, Chair
       Education & Training Committee
       National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives
       Alexandria, VA

12.   Tom McGivern, Deputy Chief Counsel
       Transportation Security Administration
       Arlington, VA

13.   Mary Ellen O'Connell, Deputy Director
       Board of Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences
       The National Academies
       Washington, DC

14.   Michelle O'Neill, Deputy Under Secretary for International Trade
       International Trade Administration
       U.S. Department of Commerce
       Washington, DC

15.   Alina Romanowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Academic Programs
       Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
       U.S. Department of State
       Washington, DC

16.   Dan Scott, Director
       Foreign Language Program Office
       Office of the Director of National Intelligence
       Washington, DC

17.   George Tanner, Chief Learning Officer
       Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer
       U.S. Department of Homeland Security
       Washington, DC

18.   Nancy Weaver, Senior Language Authority for the Department of Defense
       U.S. Department of Defense
       Washington, DC